DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 287 UD 029 285

TITLE	Toward a Vision for the Education of Latino Students: Community Voices, Student Voices. Interim Report of the Latino Commission on Educational Reform. [Volume I.]
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Latino Commission on Educational Reform.
PUB DATE	20 May 92
NOTE	215p.; For Volume II, see UD 029 284. For an earlier abridged version of Volume I, see ED 356 309.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Counseling Services; Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Development; *Disadvantaged Youth; Dropout Rate; Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Guidelines; *Hispanic Americans; Minority Group Children; Parent Participation; *Public Schools; Secondary School Students; Urban Problems; Urban Schools; *Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	Diversity (Student); Hispanic American Students; *Latinos; *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The New York City Board of Education formed the Latino Commission on Educational Reform to examine issues of concern to Latino children who comprise an increasing segment of the students in the public school system. An interim report was submitted on the dropout rate, curriculum and instruction, support services, parent and community empowerment, and factors affecting Latino student achievement. The work of the Commission revealed two important issues requiring attention: the wide diversity in Latino communities in race, language, immigrant status, nationality, socioeconomic status, and generation in the United States; and issues concerning inequities in school funding. The Commission's recommendations were short-term in scope, and the Commission expects to monitor their implementation. The Commission's findings include the following: (1) that Latino students comprise a majority of the student body in 11 of the city's 32 school districts; (2) that Latino students are likely to attend underachieving schools; and (3) that by the time they arrive in high school, Latino students are far behind others in academic achievement. The Commission offers recommendations addressing the dropout crisis, curriculum and instruction, counseling and support services, parent and community empowerment, and factors affecting student achievement. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359287

TOWARD A VISION

FOR THE

EDUCATION OF LATINO STUDENTS:

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. O. Reyes.
Latino Commission on Education
Reform
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Community Voices, Student Voices

Interim Report of the Latino Commission on Educational Reform

Submitted to:
New York City Board of Education &
Chancellor Joseph A. Fernandez
May 20, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Dr. Luis O. Reyes, Chair

LATINO COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL REFORM

UD029285

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LATINO COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL REFORM*

Mr. Luis Garden Acosta, Chief Executive Officer, El Puente
Mr. Thomas Acosta, Vice President, Shearson Asset Management
Mr. Anthony Alvarado, Superintendent, Community School District #2
Ms. Carmen Alvarez, Vice President (at large) - Special Education, U.F.T.
Ms. Nayibe Núñez Berger, Chair, Colombian American National Coalition (N.Y.C. Chapter)
Ms. Diana Caballero, Director, Puerto Rican/Latino Education Roundtable
Ms. Gladys Carrión, Esq., Commissioner, N.Y.C. Community Development Agency
Ms. Martha Chávez, Student, Stuyvesant High School
Ms. Marlene Cintrón, Director, Mayor's Office for Latino Affairs
Mr. Nestor Ciprian, Student, George Washington High School
Ms. Elizabeth Colón, Executive Director, Association of P.R. Executive Directors
Dr. Ricardo Fernández, President, Lehman College
Mr. Jack Ferrer, Student, Adlai Stevenson High School
Mr. Rubén Franco, President, Puerto Rican Legal Defense & Education Fund, Inc.
Mr. Héctor Gesauldo, Senior Vice President, United Way of New York City
Dr. Maria Torres Guzman, Director, Bilingual Programs, Teachers College
Dr. Jaime Inclán, M.D., Roberto Clemente Family Guidance Center, Gouverneur Hospital
Ms. Claribel Lozada, Parent & Member, Community School Board #14
Mr. Luis Miranda, President, Hispanic Federation of N.Y.C.
Ms. Elba Montalvo, Executive Director, Committee for Hispanic Children & Families
Dr. Josephine Nieves, Commissioner, N.Y.C. Department of Employment
Ms. Awilda Orta, Chair, Puerto Rican/Latino Education Roundtable
Mr. Joseph Pacheco, Former Superintendent, Vice President of PREA
Mr. Eduardo Padró, Chair, Board of Directors, ASPIRA of New York
Mr. Moisés Peréz, Executive Director, Alianza Dominicana
Ms. Rosa Yolanda Pineda, Executive Director, Community Asso. of Progressive Dominicans
Ms. Julia Rivera, Executive Director, ASPIRA of New York
Mr. Roberto Ramírez, State Assemblyman, 77th District (Bronx)
Ms. Camille Rodríguez, Research Director, Higher Education Task Force, Center for Puerto Rican Studies, Hunter College
Dr. Clara Rodríguez, Professor, Fordham University at Lincoln Center
Dr. Judith Stern Torres , Director, Institutional Research, Hostos Community College
Ms. Marta Moreno Vega, President & Executive Director, Caribbean Cultural Center
Mr. Hector Velázquez, Executive Director, National Puerto Rican Forum
Ms. Nydia Velázquez, Secretary, Department of Community Affairs in the United States, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
Ms. Maritza Villegas, Guidance Counselor & Parent, Community School District 4

LATINO COMMISSION STAFF

Luis A. Duany	Staff Director
Luis M. Genao	Research Assistant
Jeanette Alicea	Administrative Assistant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to acknowledge H. Carl McCall, President of the New York City Board of Education, for his leadership in convening the Commission with support of the full Board. We also would like to thank Chancellor Joseph A. Fernández, who fully supported the work of the Commission and made his staff available to the Commission. We are encouraged by the Board's agreement to extend the timeline of the Commission in order that we expand and implement the vision we have started to develop.

This Interim Report reflects the voices of a wide range of individuals and institutions in the Latino community. With utmost respect, we recognize the students and other community leaders in our past and present who have been struggling for a better education for Latinos since at least 1950. With this same vision, the members of the Latino Commission on Educational Reform--whether students, parents, academics, or community leaders--have volunteered long hours during the last eight months, at times having to sacrifice the immediate concerns of their local constituencies for the greater good of the New York City community. In a similar vein, Fordham University Latino students and the 260 Latino high school students whom they interviewed provided expert insights under the dedicated direction of Professor Clara Rodriguez. Valuable assistance also was provided by some representatives who regularly attended the meetings of the Commission: Carmen Ambert and Betty Arce from the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Alex Betancourt from United Way, Jorge Mitey from the United Federation of Teachers, and Jenny Rivera from the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund.

In addition to thanking the members and organizations represented in the Commission, we would like to acknowledge the specific contributions of several institutions in our community. The Hispanic Federation of New York City contributed the professional help of editor Luis Solís, while the Puerto Rican/Latino Education Roundtable provided valuable computer and administrative support from Adeline Sicardo. Commission staff particularly wish to thank Diana Caballero at the Puerto Rican/Latino Education Roundtable, Camille Rodríguez at the Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos at Hunter College, Lillian Hernández (Special Assistant to Dr. Reyes at the Board of Education), Sylvia Sánchez-Rivera (Executive Secretary at Dr. Reyes' office), and Judy Stern-Torres at Hostos Community College, all of whom provided much-needed moral and professional support throughout crucial stages of this eight-month period.

The Commission has benefitted from the expertise of many staff members at the New York City Board of Education. Robin Wilner, Executive Director of the Division of Strategic Planning, Research and Development, served as the Chancellor's representative in Commission meetings. Committees within the Commission have received support from and have met with Carmen Varela-Russo, (Executive Director, Division of High Schools), María Guasp (former

Executive Director, Division of Bilingual Education), Robert Tobias (Director, Office on Research, Evaluation and Assessment), Laura Rodríguez, (Director, Office of High School Bilingual/ESL Programs), Larry Edwards (Director, Access & Compliance/High School Student Development & Support Services), Priscilla Chávez-Reilly (Director, Office of Student Guidance & Support Services), Doreen Di Martini (Deputy Executive Director, Office of Community School District Affairs), Edna Suárez-Colomba (Director, Office of Parent Involvement), Helen Weinberg (Director, Office of Adult and Continuing Education), Olga Nieves (Deputy Director, Bureau of Supplies) and Donald Douglas (Staff, Bureau of Supplies), and Bruce Irushalmi (Executive Director, Division of School Safety). Eddy Bayardelle (Superintendent, Office of Monitoring and School Improvement) and Christina Casanova (Office of Student Guidance & Support Services) provided technical assistance to particular Committees. Furthermore, Burton Sacks (former Executive Director, Office of Funded Programs) and his staff--Flora Langer (Deputy Executive Director), Marilyn Zlotnik, Ann Wolf, and John Harper--provided expert assistance with fundraising activities for the next stages of the Commission.

Our special thanks go to the following presenters to the Commission: Professor Joseph Grannis at Teachers College; Dr. Ricardo Fernández, President of Lehman College; Dr. Palmira Ríos at the New School for Social Research and Dr. Emma González at Educators for Social Responsibility; Lissette Nieves, Rhodes Scholar; and Andrea Schlesinger, Alternate Student Member of the Board.

The Commission is fortunate to be housed at Teachers College, Columbia University. We would like to thank: Dr. Michael Timpane, President; Robin Elliot, Director, Office of Development; Deborah Waxman, staff at the Office of Development; Nathan Dickmayer, Vice-President for Administration and Finance; Dr. María Torres-Guzmán, as Director of the Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Lee Fredrick, and the staff at the Department; Dr. Francisco Rivera-Batiz as Director of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education (IUME), Associate Director Marietta Saravia-Shore, and the rest of the IUME staff for their day-to-day assistance and support. Kiran Chaudhuri and Daniel Emery of Teachers College also assisted in the final editing stages of the process.

Our work would not have been possible without the generous support of the Aaron Diamond Foundation, and of Vincent McGee, its Executive Director. Their consistent support from the very beginning of this process has made it possible for our vision to develop.

Finally, we would like to warmly thank the companeros and companeras who have provided us with crucial moral support throughout this process. This report is dedicated to the Latino youth of New York City. In their eyes lies the vision for which we strive.

LATINO COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL REFORM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

In October 1991, the New York City Board of Education formed the Latino Commission on Educational Reform to examine issues of concern to Latino children who comprise an increasing segment (now more than 334,000, or 35 percent) of the students in the public school system.

Chaired by Board Member Dr. Luis Reyes, the Commission includes a total of 35 Latino leaders representing community-based organizations, colleges and universities, and government agencies, as well as students, parents, and teachers. Latino college students from Fordham University--under the supervision of Commission Member Clara Rodríguez--also participated in the Commission process by bringing out the voices of Latino students attending New York City public high schools (See Volume II of this Interim Report, Student Voices, by Dr. Clara Rodríguez).

The Commission has been charged with making recommendations to help the Board fulfill its commitment to Latino students. In its first six-month term, five Committees of the Latino Commission have examined the following areas:

- Research and Analysis on the Causes and Solutions to the Latino Dropout Crisis
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Student Counseling and Support Services
- Parent and Community Empowerment
- Factors Affecting Latino Students' Achievement

In order to do justice to our broad mandate and policy scope, the Commission sought and received approval from the Board of Education to extend our term until June 1993. At least two important issues have emerged during this short timespan that will require the Commission's concentrated attention during the next 14 months: 1) the wide diversity within Latino communities in terms of race, language, immigrant status, nationality, socioeconomic status, and generation in the U.S., and 2) issues concerning inequities in school funding, which are particularly important for a community in which about one-half of its members live under the official poverty level (see page 8 of the introduction).

The recommendations herein are generally short-term in scope, with our expectation that the Board can begin their implementation during the next 14 months of the Commission's work. While monitoring the implementation of this first set of policy recommendations, the Commission will work toward the development of long-range, systemic goals and outcomes. These will be highlighted in the Commission's final report, to be published in the summer of 1993. We also fully expect to work collaboratively with the administration of Schools Chancellor Fernández to move conceptual recommendations and the vision we have started to develop (see its elements in page 5 of the introduction) into the planning stage during the coming year.

OVERALL FINDINGS

* **Reflecting their geographic concentration, Latino students account for different proportions of the total enrollment depending on the borough.** In 1990-91, Latino students were a majority (54 percent) of the public school population in the Bronx, while the second-largest concentration was in Manhattan. More than one in four students in Brooklyn (28 percent) and Queens (26 percent) also were Latino.

* **Latino students are a majority of the student body in 11 of the 32 school districts in New York City--five in the Bronx, three in Manhattan, and three in Brooklyn.** Moreover, Latinos account for more than three-fourths of students in Districts 1 and 6, and more than two-thirds of students in Districts 7, 12, 14 and 32. Other "majority"-Latino districts include 4, 8, 9, 10, and 15. Latino students in District 24 in Queens now comprise almost one-half of the student enrollment there.

* **Latino students are segregated in schools whose students come from minority and low-socieconomic backgrounds.** About 40 percent of Latino students in New York State attend intensely segregated schools where more than 80 percent of the student body is of color. In virtually all of the 11 predominantly-Latino community school districts, more than one-half of the students receive income maintenance, and more than two-thirds of the students are eligible for free lunch.

- **Latino students are likely to attend underachieving schools.** In ten of the 11 majority-Latino community school districts, the proportion of students reading at or above grade level falls below the citywide average (47 percent). In seven of these 11 districts, fewer than two in five students read at or above grade level. In terms of mathematics, eight of these 11 districts score below the citywide average in mathematics (62.7 percent at or above grade level), and six of them score well below that, at under 55 percent.

- **One in four Latino ninth-graders did not complete high school four years later as of June 1991, showing a dropout rate that was 40 percent higher for Latinos than for all students.** Compared to 19 percent of the Board's 1990 Cohort Dropout Study, 27 percent of Latino students had dropped out by the expected date of high school graduation. While only 32 percent of high school students were Latino, 41 percent of the dropouts were Latino.

- **Of the 124 public high schools in New York City, 23 high schools--which are likely to be poor and overcrowded--have a student enrollment with more than 50 percent Latino students.** (For specific high schools, see p. 16 in the Introduction, note 6). Nineteen of these schools have free-lunch eligibility rates higher than 35 percent. More than one-half of these schools are intensely overcrowded (more than 125 percent building utilization rate), making them twice as likely to be overcrowded as those 23 high schools with Latino enrollments of less than 12 percent.

- **By the time they arrive in high school, Latino students are far behind others in terms of academic achievement.** Although data on high school mathematics achievement were not available, high school reading scores indicate that the disadvantaged situation of majority-Latino public schools continues through middle- and into high school. About one-half of the 23 majority-Latino high schools had below 40 percent of their students reading at or above grade level. These 23 high schools were twice as likely to score at this low level as were the 23 high schools with the smallest concentrations of Latino students.

- **Latino students are severely underrepresented in the four specialized academic high schools whose dropout rates are among the lowest citywide.** Latino students represent only 4 percent of the enrollment at Stuyvesant High School, 9 percent at the Bronx High School of Math and Science, 15 percent at Brooklyn Technical High School, and 21 percent at Fiorello La Guardia High School--all of which are well below the 32 percent of the citywide high school population that is Latino.

- **As a result of how teachers are distributed in the New York City schools based on seniority and credentials, resources in terms of personnel are sorely lacking in many predominantly-Latino districts.** There are two main causes for this unequal distribution. The first is the inter-district variation of average teacher salaries, and the second is the usage of a service-cost allocation based on teacher salaries.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMITTEE

I. CAUSES AND SOLUTIONS TO THE LATINO DROPOUT CRISIS

After considering issues related to students and dropout prevention programs, the Board of Education's allocation of resources for these programs, and structural obstacles to collaboration between cbo's and schools, the Commission recommends that the Board of Education:

- Institutionalize an annual process of surveying students, bringing out their voices, and eliciting feedback in terms of the planning, design, development, and evaluation of school and dropout prevention initiatives as well as of general curricula.

- Report measures of Latino student success which are tied to issues of economic security and occupational opportunity. Furthermore, the Board must set specific goals that target performance outcomes for Latino students in problem areas, i.e., an (x) percent dropout reduction by year (y), and (x) degree of mastery/achievement in math and science by year (y).

- Seek new and creative funding schemes in contract awards that target school retention and dropout prevention initiatives for Latino students. In order to facilitate the stabilizing of community programs, the Board should introduce legislative initiatives in the New York State Assembly so as to ensure categorical funding streams that will create multi-year funding patterns for community-based organizations (CBO's).

The Student Voices research project has shown us that Latino students "know the deal." They know when they are getting a good education, and when they are not. They also have good ideas on how to improve their education. The study concludes that, in the case of Latino dropouts, schools do make a difference. The study's recommendations include:

- Schools with high Latino dropout rates must address the issues raised by students in the schools visited, concerning the lack of support and encouragement they perceive is given to Latino students. All schools should encourage Latino students to apply to a variety of public and private four year colleges.

- All high schools should introduce cross-cultural studies as a requirement to bridge the gap between the different ethnic and racial groups in the school. Schools should take seriously the teaching of Latino cultures, and not just celebrate multiculturalism in the abstract.

- High schools should develop bilingual night programs open to both parents and students wherein they could improve their work skills.

- The Board of Education should adopt, as a premise for future policy, that Latino students do not want to drop out.

- The Board should conduct further research that will explore why the experience of many LEP students is more positive than that of non-LEP Latino students, and what is the relationship of racial climates to the success of Latino students.

II. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

The Committee has examined several areas related to curriculum and instruction where new local initiatives would create culturally appropiate models of academic success for Latinos. These four proposals would also address the means through which students can be prepared for membership in a democratic society: leadership development, community service, and social action. The four proposals are:

1) **A system-wide Latino Educational Reform Initiative.** This initiative would stimulate and initiate model programs focused on curtailing the well-documented academic failure and dropout rates of Latino students, by promoting instructional practices, governance structures, and extracurricular activities that benefit Latino students. With monies from private and public sources, the schools that apply would receive first planning and then implementation grants.

2) **The Latino Leadership School.** This small open-enrollment high school of 700 seventh- to twelfth-graders would be based on the ASPIRA model would serve as a model for the education of Latino students and for the effective implementation of curricula that facilitates multi-ethnic understanding. The School would have three overarching goals: a) to provide a rigorous academic program that will prepare all students for college; b) to create a model of professional practice around educational issues relevant to the success of Latino students, and c) to become a focal point of involvement of the larger Latino community in school reform efforts.

3) **Moving beyond the ASPIRA Consent Decree to address issues of quality in bilingual education.** The Committee has identified four key factors related to improving the quality of these programs. Specifically, the Commission recommends establishing a Bilingual/Multicultural Institute designed as a university-public school collaborative focused on the professional development of bilingual teachers and administrators. The Board should provide a salary differential for teachers with bilingual skills to attract and retain well-qualified candidates for the bilingual teaching profession.

4) **Addressing the underachievement of Latino students in mathematics.** This implies that all Board math initiatives should target Latino students, whether limited-English proficient or not.

III. COUNSELING AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Counseling and support services are key in correcting the equity issues that adversely affect Latino students. The Committee has a vision of the school counselor as student advocate linking all services to meet the needs of Latino students and their families. The major recommendations are, as follows:

* Increase the ratio of counselors, especially bilingual counselors, to the numbers of students they serve;

* Increase the numbers of bilingual counselors for early childhood to provide early intervention and to increase parent involvement;

* Resolve equitably the mandated needs for counseling in special education and the needs for bilingual counselors and counseling services for Latino students in general education;

* Improve linkages with community based-organizations including a revision of the contracting process;

* Enhance the role of the counselor so that all counselors can become student advocate, share their expertise in multicultural perspectives, and participate in ongoing staff development;

* Monitor the implementation of school guidance plans;

* Create a Migration Orientation Program and a Migration Resource Center to meet the needs of newly arrived Latino students.

IV. PARENT AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT

The Committee focused on parental involvement from two perspectives: participation in school governance and involvement in improving the quality of education. The Committee also looked at the mechanisms available in the public school system to facilitate the participation of parents, community residents, students, and community-based organizations. Lastly, the Committee considered the Board's contracting and procurement practices as they relate to Latino contractors. The Commission recommends that the Board and Chancellor:

- Establish a special community school board elections unit to educate parents, to train potential candidates and to monitor the conduct of the Board of Elections.
- Prepare and implement procedures to maximize parent voter registration, education and turnout.
- Require from the Chancellor an independent yearly evaluation of the state of Latino parent involvement in governance, including data analysis, quality of participation and parent surveys.
- Reestablish the position of Bilingual Community Liaison in every school and district with more than 25 percent Latino enrollment.
- Charge the Office of Monitoring and School Improvement and the Office of Community District Affairs with enforcing the provisions of the revised Parents' Blue Book.
- Provide public reporting on adult education data by race and ethnicity, program and borough, on an annual basis.
- Develop a plan with specific targets of utilization of minority and women-owned companies throughout the Board's procurement system.
- Develop and implement a mechanism for identifying Latino and other minority/women-owned vendors of color.
- Assign purchasing agents to increase the number of Latino and other minority/women-owned vendors on the eligibility lists.

V. FACTORS AFFECTING LATINO STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT

The Committee chose to think about the needs of Latino children and their families in a holistic way, considering the conditions of their lives in New York City. Therefore, it chose five broad sets of issues on which to concentrate. These were school/community relations, school/work linkages, self esteem, intergroup relations, and security. The Commission recommends that :

- The Board extend resources for the development of community schools in majority Latino school districts.
- Schools serve LEP and English proficient students together in a two-way bilingual enrichment model which values the languages and incorporates the cultural backgrounds of all participants.
- Schools incorporate activities into instruction which teach students success by encouraging them to solve problems in the context of "real-world" activities.
- Schools train students in strategies for resolving intergroup conflicts without violence: analysis of problems, peer mediation and cultural understanding.
- Schools and districts train School Safety Officers in cultural and linguistic diversity issues along with child and adolescent development.
- The Board mandate that each school report, on a semi-annual basis, when, how, and by whom the building has been used for community-related functions: and each district report what public and/or private funds have been sought to provide activities for youth.

VOLUME I:

COMMUNITY VOICES

ECHOES FROM "THE PUERTO RICAN STUDY".

The intent of the Latino Commission on Educational Reform, convened by the New York City Board of Education in fall 1991, is not to rehash the policy and programmatic recommendations of previous study groups and policy reports. Yet, we cannot do justice to the context of our situation without providing some historical perspective to our mission and charge. As we review the last thirty-five years of our community's history, we can not help but notice the years of thoughtful recommendations which have not been fully implemented.

In 1953, the year that the New York City Board of Education commenced The Puerto Rican Study, there were approximately 40,000 "non-English speaking Puerto Rican students" in the city public school system.[1] By the 1990-1991 academic year, Board of Education reports indicated that this number had doubled: there were 80,354 limited-English proficient (LEP) Latino students enrolled in the school system; with another 253,814 Latino students who are not LEP. As noted in the Demographic Overview of this report, the total number of Latino students now accounts for thirty-five percent of the total public school enrollment.

Appreciating this dramatic increase entails perceiving not only budding populations (quantitative change), but also growing diversity (qualitative differences). To understand and to educate the present Latino student population requires an awareness of the heterogeneity of the cultures, races, classes, languages, ages and histories of the city's Latino peoples. While the responsibilities of the public school system have broadened, responsiveness to the needs of Latino students has yet to be significantly realized. Many of the recommendations made by reports dating from 1958 (The Puerto Rican Study) to the present study are essentially the same. Lamentably, after almost forty years, many of the recommendations and demands of the Latino community still remain to be implemented.

The Puerto Rican Study was the first major study on the instruction of "non-English-speaking" Puerto Rican children in the New York City public schools. Despite significant flaws, this $1,000,000 study is one of the most complete investigations ever attempted of the educational reality of the "non-English speaking" child, specifically of the Puerto Rican child in the continental United States.[2] The study outlined three main educational issues or "problems":[3]

> 1) What are the effective models and materials for teaching English as a second language to Puerto Ricans?
>
> 2) What are the most effective techniques the school can promote to help the Puerto Rican adjust to the community?
>
> 3) Who are the Puerto Rican pupils in the New York City schools?

Currently, we have no answer for the third question, as the Board of Education ceased collecting enrollment and other basic statistical data on Puerto Rican students in 1977. Nor do we have an accurate count of subsequently arrived Latino students.

Though The Puerto Rican Study has been criticized for confusing the question of how to educate Latino children with that of how to teach them English,[4] its recommendations still stand.

The Study posited 23 suggestions for further "lines of attack". The recommendations included the provision of offering what may be considered an early form of ESL training for students and staff, and establishing procedures to encourage parental participation in schools and in the community. The Puerto Rican Study also encouraged the recruitment and training of individuals of "Hispanic and preferably of Puerto Rican background"; a system-wide recognition of "the heterogeneity of the non-English-speaking pupils"; and more effective coordination of services (public and private) with schools in order to accelerate and facilitate the socio-cultural adjustment of parents and students.

Forty years later, these recommendations have been partially realized thanks to bilingual education mandates: these have been won through the community struggles culminating in the court-sponsored 1974 Aspira Consent Decree. But the promise of quality bilingual/bicultural education has yet to be fulfilled. Obstacles include the emphasis on compensatory approaches; the continuing shortage of fully- trained and certified bilingual teachers; the still-ineffective coordination of public and private services with our public schools; and the system's failure to ensure significant Latino parent and community participation in our schools.

In April 1967, approximately ten years after The Puerto Rican Study, the First Citywide Conference of the Puerto Rican Community submitted thirty-two recommendations to the Mayor of New York. Many of the proposals were identical to those advanced by The Puerto Rican Study. The major difference between The Puerto Rican Study and that 1968 Mayor's Report (Puerto Ricans Confront Problems of the Complex Urban Society: A Design for Change.) was not necessarily one of content but of attitude. As Father Joseph Fitzpatrick explains,

> The conference demanded bilingual programs not simply as an instrument for learning English, but also for developing and preserving the knowledge of Spanish among Puerto Rican children; the introduction of courses in Puerto Rican culture, literature, and history; a much greater involvement of the Puerto Rican community in the planning of school programs...; the use of Puerto Rican paraprofessionals as aides to teachers and staffs; and representation on the board of education.[5]

The demands presented by the First Citywide Conference were immediately echoed and upheld by the Aspira symposium of May 1968. The collective recommendations issued during 1968 were more specific and fervent than those posed by the 1958 Puerto Rican Study. Yet, excluding the cogent issue of board representation, they were consistent with the community's ten-year old demands.[6] In 1987, after this municipal conference presented its demands a more heterogeneous and militant citywide Latino coalition was demanding Latino representation on the Board of Education of a different Mayor. A year later (1988), Latino community leaders and educators were demanding that the first African American Chancellor respond to a comprehensive action agenda that included the issues of culturally-relevant curriculum and instruction and a mutually respectful partnership between the school system and the Puerto Rican/Latino community.

In 1984, the National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics published a comprehensive two-volume report: Make Something Happen: Hispanics and Urban School Reform. The National

Commission report added to the thirty years of petitions the ardent pleas of Latino students to "make something happen".

Two years later, in 1986, reports faced many of the same issues as the thirty-year old Puerto Rican Study. The Mayor's Commission on Hispanic Concerns unabashedly stated that it addressed old problems with not entirely new recommendations. The one major difference was one of time: "after almost three decades of neglect the problems have escalated to epidemic proportions." Similarly, the reports by the Governor's Advisory Committee for Hispanic Affairs, New York State Hispanics: A Challenging Minority and A People At Risk: Hispanic School Dropouts, identified and attacked the same historical continuum of educational neglect.

> For the last 30 years, numerous studies, reports, and congressional hearings have addressed the Hispanic high school dropout rate....Several reports later and after millions of dollars have been spent on extensive research projects to write these reports, the conditions are getting worse. Something must be done in order to "make something happen.[7]

As in previous decades, the disproportionate dropout rate among Latino students was the focus of reports in the 1980's. The failure of the New York City public schools to educate and graduate Latino students in adequate numbers has been a constant concern. During the 1987-1988 school year, Aspira of New York established an educational reform agenda group representing the Puerto Rican/Latino Education Roundtable, the Puerto Rican Educators Association and other organizations. In light of the September, 1987 resignation of Chancellor Nathan Quinones and the protracted national search for a permanent replacement, this educational reform agenda group focused on developing an action agenda for the incoming Chancellor, Dr. Richard H. Green. During the first week of Chancellor Green's administration, the reform agenda group presented the Chancellor with a document, Su Nombre es Hoy (Their Name is Today), outlining an action agenda for his first one hundred days. As the title Su Nombre es Hoy indicated, Aspira and the Latino community could no longer wait for positive and systemic change to occur. Immediate action was demanded:

> We do not accept the notion that quality bilingual/bicultural education is too costly to implement... We are prepared to collaborate with the Board of Education in developing a multi-year plan to implement a full bilingual/bicultural program. We are committed to helping the Chancellor build the political constituency to attract and recruit qualified bilingual/bicultural professional staff and to procure the necessary funding.[8]

Though the tactics and rhetoric had changed, the recommendations were still essentially the same: systematic dropout prevention efforts, bilingual/bicultural programs for students and staff, procedures to encourage parental participation in schools and in the community, the recruitment of bilingual and Latino professionals at all levels, culturally- appropriate student-support services, and the development of an official policy statement embracing cultural and linguistic diversity--what the Puerto Rican Study labeled the "heterogeneity of the non-English-speaking pupils".

Much to the dismay of Latino educators and community leaders, Chancellor Green had no thought-out policy or programmatic response when, three months later, the Board of Education published its annual dropout report. The report showed the continuing disproportionate dropout rate for Latino students. In response to the uproar over the school system's lack of a comprehensive response to the continuing educational crisis, Chancellor Green appointed a working group of his top administrators headed by Gladys Carrion, former Chair of the Board of Directors of Aspira, to fashion such a response in short order.

The 1988 "Carrion Report", formally entitled Recommendations of the Chancellor's Working Group on Latino Educational Opportunity, delivered greater detail to the thirty-year old recommendations. The report provided clear guidelines by which the educational system could meet its specific responsibilities to Latinos and to society as a whole. Among other things, it suggested establishing linkages with mass-media organizations and nurturing collaborations with community-based organizations (CBO'S).

In 1988, Aspira delivered a second, more elaborate version of its action agenda: Su Nombre es Hoy II. The clarity and vigor which permeated the Aspira and Carrion reports were yet more positive signs that a community considered at risk would no longer wait for change. Constituencies continued to make specific demands and recommendations.

In 1989, New York State's Task Force On Minorities: Equity and Excellence concluded what may prove to be the most controversial pedagogical document of the 80's and 90's, A Curriculum of Inclusion. The report, essentially a statement for multicultural curricular reform, demanded that New York State and whole the United States weave the notion of diversity throughout every part of the K-12 curriculum. On behalf of Latinos the Curriculum of Inclusion demanded that the illusion of Hispanic homogeneity be dispelled. An appreciation of the "heterogeneity" of Latino peoples was once again recommended and primarily outlined.

Ages ago, The Puerto Rican Study declared: "the time to begin is now--A year gone from a child's life is gone forever"[9]. Forty years after that, we echo that voice, with more information and urgency.

ENDNOTES

1. Mary Jenkins, "Bilingual Education in New York City" p. 10, in Bilingual Education in New York City: A Compendium of Reports, ed. Francesco Cordasco (New York: Arno Press, 1978).

2. Francesco Cordasco Puerto Ricans On The Mainland: The Educational Experience (The Legacy of the Past and the Agony of the Present), p. 354 in Bilingual Education in New York City: A Compendium of Reports, ed. Francesco Cordasco (New York: Arno Press, 1978).

3. The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957: A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools in the City of New York (New York: Board of Education, 1958), p.4.

4. op. cit. Jenkins, p10.

5. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, Puerto Rican Americans and the Meaning of Migration to the Mainland (New York: Prentice Hall, 1987) p.159.

6. ibid. Fitzpatrick, p.159.

7. New York State, Governor's Advisory Committee for Hispanic Affairs, "A People At Risk: Hispanic School Dropouts," p.99-100.

8. "Su Nombre Es Hoy" written by Dr. Luis Reyes and presented by Aspira of New York to the New York City Board of Education, 1988 p. 1.

9. op. cit. The Puerto Rican Study, p.237.

INTRODUCTION

The Commission's Charge

According to the Board of Education, more than one in four (27.2 percent) of Latino students who entered New York City high schools in September 1986 did not graduate four years later.

The publication of this fact by the Board of Education in its 1991 Cohort Dropout Study was one of the factors behind the formation of the Latino Commission on Educational Reform on October 1991. The Commission was established in order to ensure that the growing numbers of Latino students in New York City schools receive appropriate, quality instruction and support services conducive to high educational achievement. Too often, Latino students leave school after not being exposed to high-quality curricula and instructional programs relevant to their reality; attending underfunded, overcrowded schools where learning anything is a challenging task onto itself; not having the counseling and support services they need; and not feeling that their parents and community can affect their education. The Commission expects the New York City Board of Education to create change in these and other areas relevant to the education of Latino youth, especially those that are covered with specific recommendations in this Interim Report.

Chaired by Board Member Dr. Luis Reyes, the Commission includes Latino leaders from colleges and universities, community-based organizations, and government agencies, as well as students, parents, and teachers. We also have been fortunate to draw upon the immense expertise of Latino college students from Fordham University, who--under the supervision of Commission Member Prof. Clara Rodríguez--have brought out the voices of Latino students attending New York City public high schools (See Volume II of this Interim Report, Student Voices, by Dr. Clara Rodríguez).

The Commission has been charged with making recommendations to help the Board fulfill its commitment to Latino students, who now represent 35 percent of the citywide school enrollment. In this first six-month term, five Committees of the Latino Commission have examined the following areas:

- Research and Analysis on the Causes and Solutions to the Latino Dropout Crisis
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Student Counseling and Support Services
- Parent and Community Empowerment
- Factors Affecting Latino Students' Achievement

The Structure and Scope of this Interim Report

Following a piece that inserts the Commission's work in the context of historical record of reports on the education of Puerto Rican and Latino students in New York City public schools are the five chapters in Volume I that present the work of these Committees.[1] Each Committee has generated a report which explores major school-level and system-wide policy issues, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations for improvement. The concerns of the Committees necessarily overlap, since the issues that Latino students face are not neatly divided. Thus, some cross-cutting topics (such as self-esteem, linkages of schools to Latino-based community organizations, and the need for more bilingual and bicultural staff in the school system) are treated in several sections of this report, albeit from different perspectives.

---

[1]. The notes in each chapter are explained at the end of each of the six chapters, including "Echoes from The Puerto Rican Study".

The voices of Latino high school students serve as the basis for Volume II, a report on four school visits coordinated by Dr. Clara Rodríguez. These students' voices are brought to us thanks to the probing work of Fordham University Latino undergraduate students. Created as part of the Committee on Research and Analysis of the Causes and Solutions to the Latino Dropout Crisis, Student Voices reflects the insights and perspectives of these young Latinos on many of the issues covered by the five Committees of the Latino Commission.

While the original intent of the Commission was to present its finding and final recommendations to the Board at the conclusion of its original six-month term, it quickly became apparent to us that the work of the Commission is far from complete. In order to do justice to our broad mandate and policy scope, the Commission sought and received approval from the Board of Education to extend our term until June 1993.

Furthermore, several important issues have emerged during this short timespan that will require our concentrated attention during the next 14 months. The first one is the wide diversity within Latino communities in terms of race, language, immigrant status, nationality, socioeconomic status, and generation in the U.S.. In its second year, the Commission intends to document and address the fact that, although all Latino students at some point have to confront the prejudices and negative images of Latinos in this society, black Latino students may well face many more negative reactions from school personnel than light-skinned Latino students. Similarly, the recommendations contained herein need to be implemented in a manner that considers the growing number of immigrants from the Dominican Republic and Central and South America. The Commission understands--and will continue to look closely at the implications of this fact--that some of these students' educational needs are different from those of, for example, second-generation, U.S.-born Latino students attending New York City public schools.

The second set of issues crucial to the education of Latino students which the Commission has felt unable to address fully pertains to school funding. The fact is that, at a time when the continuing impoverishment of our communities leads us to place increased hopes on the education and future productivity of our youth, there has been a decline in federal, state, and local support to education. Very often, reduced public support falls unevenly on the most vulnerable sectors of society. Indeed, it is becoming widely acknowledged that the social and economic policies of the past two decades produced a greater disparity between the haves and have-nots. What is less well-documented is the degree to which this growing disparity has affected the schools which Latino students attend (see end of this introduction for a special section on the school conditions and resources for Latino students).

Thus, the recommendations herein are generally short-term in scope, with our expectation that the Board can begin their implementation during the next 14 months of the Commission's work. While monitoring the implementation of this first set of policy recommendations, the Commission will work toward the development of long-range, systemic goals and outcomes. These will be highlighted in the Commission's final report, to be published in the summer of 1993.

We also fully expect to work collaboratively with the administration of Schools Chancellor Fernández to move conceptual recommendations into the planning stage during the coming year.

A Vision for the Education of Latino Youth

In order to begin defining what should be the school system's responsibility toward Latino students, the Latino Commission has developed the initial components of a vision for the education of Latino youth. These should include:

- Developing a sense of identity based on a study of our histories and cultures
- Acknowledging and affirming our diversity and shared values
- Developing and maintaining bilingual literacy and biculturalism
- Linking schools with the Latino community and making these schools sites of community activities
- Linking schools with growing sectors of the labor market, and exposing our students to a wide variety of professional and higher education opportunities
- Ensuring that our students are exposed to challenging curricula that encourage them to move beyond rote memorization into formulating, testing, and exploring concepts, theories, and approaches to real-life problems
- Developing our youth into leaders through skills development, problem-solving, and community service
- Empowering students to have a conscience about who they are, how they are connected to other ethnic groups, and how they can become leaders in a multicultural society.
- Eliminating school-funding inequities and ensuring that Latino students have access to high-quality resources and teachers
- Supporting and enabling students to cope with health risks and societal pressures while motivating and equipping them to make healthy choices about their education and career
- Creating personalized school environments and individualized

educational planning

- Building a community of inquiry and mutual respect committed to human rights and social justice
- Increasing parental literacy, educational attainment, and participation in school governance.

These initial components of a vision have to be contrasted with the current situation and immense potential of Latino students in the New York City public schools. Our children enter school with the hope and enthusiasm for learning that are required to make our vision become a reality, but this hope starts to fade in the public schools.

Overview: Demographics of Latino Students in New York City Schools

According to the October 31, 1990 audited registers, there were 334,168 Latino students in the New York City Public Schools, representing 35 percent of the total student population (see Appendix). The total enrollment has been growing steadily in the last few years, in large part due to the dramatic influx of immigrant students into the school system. Between the 1989-1990 and the 1991-92 school years, 120,000 immigrant students (including 23,000 students from the Dominican Republic) entered the New York City public schools.

The proportion of the total enrollment that Latinos represent has been growing steadily since 1967, the first year for which ethnic data is available. Latino students represented 26.2 percent of the student enrollment in 1970, 30.5 percent in 1980, and 35.0 percent in 1990. Similarly, the total number of Latino students has grown steadily since 1979, when there were 286,664 Latino students, until 1990, when Latino student enrollment had grown by more than 47,000 (16.6 percent growth in eleven years) and had reached 334,168. At this rate of growth, Latino student enrollment would reach about 390,000 nine years from now, becoming the largest ethnic group of students in the school system.

This total Latino student enrollment is not distributed equally across the grades. In 1990, Latino students accounted for 37 percent of elementary-school students, 35 percent of junior-high schools, and 32 percent of those at the high school level. These different proportions of Latino students by grade level may reflect both the increasing Latino enrollment in the lower grades and the early exit of Latino students who drop out of the school system.

Similarly, Latino students are geographically concentrated in specific boroughs and school districts. In 1990-91, Latino students were a majority of the public school population in the Bronx (with Latinos representing 54 percent of the student enrollment in that borough), with the second-largest concentration being in Manhattan (48 percent of the total enrollment was Latino). Furthermore, more than one in four students in Brooklyn (28 percent) and Queens (26 percent) were Latino, while only one in ten (10 percent) students attending Staten Island public schools was Latino.

In terms of school districts, Latinos account for more than three-fourths of students in Districts 1 and 6, more than two-thirds of students in Districts 7, 12, 14 and 32; and more than half of the students in Districts 4, 8, 9, 10, and 15. In sum, Latino students are a majority of the student body in 11 of the 32 school districts in New York City--five in the Bronx, three in Manhattan, and three in Brooklyn. Finally, Latino students in District 24 in Queens now comprise almost one-half of the student enrollment there.

In addition to this growth and concentration of Latino students, the system has had to confront the growing diversity of this population. Whereas 89 percent of Latino students in 1968 and 81 percent in 1977 (the last year when student data were collected by Latino subgroup) were Puerto Rican, the current estimate for the Latino population in New York City is that about half of all Latinos living in New York are Puerto Rican [1] . It is important to note that despite this dramatic decrease in the proportion of Latino students that are Puerto Rican, the Puerto Rican student population continues to increase. At the same time, the rapidly-increasing numbers of students from the Dominican Republic, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, and other Central and South American countries poses new opportunities and challenges to the school system. Unfortunately, the school system does not report data in a systematic way that would allow for clear planning and interventions adapted to the different needs of growing Latino communities.

The Latino community in New York City is not only diverse, but poorer than other ethnic groups. According to the most recent data available, in 1987 about 42 percent of Latinos, and 48 percent of Puerto Ricans specifically, lived under the federal poverty level, compared to eight percent of non-Hispanic whites and 34 percent of non-Hispanic blacks. [2] At the national level, Puerto Rican children have been found to "face the greatest risk of being poor, with a higher poverty rate (48.4 percent) than any other race or ethnic group, including blacks and Mexican-Americans... More than one-fifth of all Puerto Rican children...lived in families with incomes below half of the official poverty level in 1989, [thus having incomes of] less than

$5,000 annually for a family of three".[3]

Not surprisingly, Latino students are concentrated in schools where an overwhelming amount of the students come from families of low socioeconomic status. In 10 of the 11 school districts in which Latino students constitute the majority of the enrollment[4], more than one-half of the students receive income maintenance, according to data from the Board of Education. Similarly, while 57 percent of the citywide enrollment receive free lunch--a measure of low socieconomic status--all of the 11 predominantly-Latino community school districts have free-lunch eligibility rates higher than 67 percent.

At the high school level, the proportion of students eligible for free lunch is much higher in the schools where Latino students are concentrated than in those where they are underrepresented. In fact, 21 of the 23 high schools with the smallest concentrations of Latino students (under 12 percent of the enrollment) have free-lunch eligibility rates below 25 percent; on the other hand, 19 of the 23 high schools where Latino students account for more than half of the enrollment have free-lunch eligibility rates above 35 percent. While the official poverty data cited above seems to suggest that Puerto Rican students are the most likely to come from poor families, the fact is that all Latino students attend schools mired in poverty.

The Latino High School Dropout Problem

Currently, no official data are available to suggest differences in dropout rates between Latino subgroups, although these may well exist. Other than Native American students, no other group of students in New York City has a dropout rate as high as Latinos. Twenty-seven percent of students from both of these groups who entered high school in the fall of 1986 did not graduate four years later, compared to 21 percent for blacks, 16 percent for Asians, 15 percent for whites, and 19 percent citywide. This dropout rate has been estimated to be even higher among Puerto Ricans (35 percent) specifically [5]. The fact is that Latino students are overrepresented among the system's dropouts: while only 32 percent of high school students are Latino, 41 percent of the dropouts are Latino. In effect, the dropout rate among Latino students is 40 percent higher than the citywide rates.

The condition and quality of the high schools that Latino students attend in New York City may help to explain why so many of them drop out. Latino students are underrepresented in the academic high schools--constituting 30 percent of the total enrollment--that register the lowest dropout rates for Latino students. Among the most selective high schools, Latino students represent only 4 percent of the enrollment at Stuyvesant High School, 9 percent at the Bronx High School of Math and Science, 15 percent at Brooklyn Technical High School, and 21 percent at Fiorello La Guardia High School--all of which are well below the 32 percent of the citywide high school population that is Latino.

At the same time, Latinos account for 36 percent of the total enrollment in alternative high schools, which register a wide range of Latino dropout rates. Finally, Latinos are somewhat overrepresented (39 percent) in the vocational high schools of the City, all of which register Latino dropout rates that are lower than the citywide rate. The final special category of high schools (educational-option schools) registers very low Latino dropout rates, and ranges in Latino representation from a low of 7 percent of the enrollment in Paul Robeson High School to a high of 52 percent in Norman Thomas High School.

School Conditions for Latino Students: Overcrowded, Segregated, and Underfunded

Not only are Latino students extremely underrepresented in the most selective high schools in the City, but the schools where they are concentrated are likely to be overcrowded and segregated. There are 23 high schools where Latinos make up at least 50 percent of the enrollment.[6] These high schools are more than twice as likely (61 versus 26 percent) to be intensely overcrowded--i.e., to have an enrollment that is more than 125 percent of the official capacity of the school building--as the 23 high schools where Latino students account for less than 12 percent of the student enrollment. Furthermore, the majority-Latino high schools are half as likely as the latter schools to be underutilized, i.e., the building utilization rate is under 100 percent.

According to a 1992 report commissioned by the National School Boards Association, 86 percent of Latino students in New York State are enrolled in segregated schools where more than 50 percent of the enrollment is composed of students of color. Moreover, an astounding 40 percent are enrolled in schools that are intensely segregated (more than 80 percent of the students are of color). While segregated schools do not need to be low-achieving schools, these schools often lack the resources needed to provide students with a superior education.

As a result of how teachers are distributed in the New York City schools based on seniority and credentials, resources in terms of personnel are sorely lacking in many predominantly-Latino districts. Community school districts receive the bulk of their money from Module 2a, a Central Board allocation that provides the money for teacher salaries and support personnel. For the last twenty-three years, the system that has been used to calculate this allocation gives a significantly greater share of the tax dollars to affluent non-minority districts than it does to minority and Latino districts. Community districts with student populations that are more than 50 percent Latino bear a major burden of this underfunding.

There are two main causes for this unequal distribution. The first is the inter-district variation of average teacher salaries, and the second is the usage of a service-cost allocation based on teacher salaries. In using the service-cost method, the Board first determines how many teachers a district will need (base number of teachers) and then agrees to pay for them, regardless of cost. When it was first devised, this method appeared to be fair and reasonable: no school district (or building) should be deprived of its legitimate number of teachers because its teacher salary costs were higher than other districts.

However, this method of distributing tax-levied instructional monies ignores and fails to compensate for the great variation in average teacher salaries among community-school districts. For example, in the January 1992 Mid-year Allocation Adjustment (which shows the actual money that will be allocated this school year), the Board of Education computes the highest average teacher salary in the

City for Community School District (CSD) 31 (Staten Island) at $44,911 and the third lowest of $37,054 for CSD 32 (Bushwick), which is 63.4 percent Latino. The net result of the current funding formula is that CSD 31 receives $65,531,436 in its base allocation, while CSD 32 receives $27,348,816. Thus, CSD 31 starts out receiving $7,857 more for teacher than does CSD 32.

If CSD 32 were funded at the average teacher salary of CSD 31, the former would then receive $33,147,911, which would mean $5,799,095 more than it currently gets for its base allocation. This would be enough to hire 145 more teachers than now, and to thereby increase its teaching staff by 20 percent.

Yet the inequity only starts with this base allocation. Compounding and spreading inequity into other allocations, the base allocation is used to calculate several other allocations, most important of which are the supporting percent allocation (ten percent of the base) and pension and fringe benefits (34 percent of the base). Thus, CSD 32 is deprived further of another $2.5 million dollars by the application of the inequitable base to these two important allocations.

The Commission estimates that, in the past two fiscal years, the eleven school districts with majority-Latino populations have been underfunded by more than $25 million in tax-levied funds, or more than $1 million each year per district. At the same time, the top three districts in reading (CSD's 26, 31, and 25) have been overfunded by more than $40 million. Without a doubt, the continued use of district average-teacher salary to compute the most important allocations received by community school districts is a source of major concern for Latinos.

Low Academic Achievement in Predominantly-Latino Schools

As of yet, no official data breaking down academic achievement by ethnic group is available from the school system. Nevertheless, district-level statistics reveal a clear picture of the academic effects of the continued socioeconomic disadvantage suffered by Latino youth in their schools and communities.

At the elementary school level, 1990-91 data shown in the appendices of this Interim Report point to the underachievement of predominantly-Latino community school districts. While at the City level 47 percent of elementary-school children read at or above grade level, this proportion falls below average in ten of the 11 community school districts where more than half of the students are Latino. In fact, in seven of these eleven community school districts, the proportion of children reading at or above grade level falls below 40 percent. Similarly, only three of these 11 districts score above the citywide average in mathematics (62.7 percent at or above grade level).[7]

The achievement gap continues at the middle school level, at which many Latino students are known to leave school after years of academic failure. In reading, eight of these 11 districts (about three in four) score below the citywide average of 45.1 percent reading at or above grade level. In mathematics, about two in three of these predominantly Latino districts falls below the citywide average (45.8 percent performing at or above grade level). As the Board itself recently expressed in its "Requests for Funding" document, "[our own] research indicates that student achievement in eighth-grade math is an important indicator of future scholastic achievement." While this Interim Report's section on Curriculum and Instruction treats the topic of mathematics achievement at length in its third chapter, it is important to note here that any new funds coming into the school system for middle-school initiatives should be targeted to low-achieving districts, many of which have high concentrations of Latino students.

Although data on high school mathematics achievement were not available to the Commission, high school reading scores shown in the Appendix indicate that the disadvantaged situation of predominantly Latino public schools continues at the high school level. In fact, among the 23 high schools where Latino students account for more than one-half of the student body, about half of the schools averaged below 40 percent reading at or above grade level. Moreover, these 23 predominantly-Latino high schools were twice as likely to score at this low level as were the 23 high schools with the smallest concentrations of Latino students.

The data that are starting to become available document the results of the funding inequities experienced by the schools that Latino children attend. As our population continues to grow, the underachievement of Latino students becomes a matter of urgent concern for New York City as a whole. This new documentation supports the claims that we as a community have been making for more than thirty years. As the next section illustrates, this Interim Report expands upon themes that have been important to the Latino community for a long period of time.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. See Suzanne De Camp, The Linguistic Minorities of New York City, Community Service Society: New York City, 1991, p. 13.

2. See Rosenberg, Terry, Poverty in New York City, 1985-88: The Crisis Continues, New York: Community Service Society, 1989.

3. See Miranda, Leticia, Latino Child Poverty in the United States, Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, 1991, p. 23.

4. These are school districts 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, and 32.

5. See Vincenzo Milione, Statistical Profile of Educational Attainment and High School Dropout Rates among Puerto Ricans and Other Hispanics in New York City, New York City: J. Calandra Italian American Institute, City University of New York, August 1990.

6. These high schools are South Bronx, George Washington, Eastern District, Bushwick, Hostos-Lincoln Academy, James Monroe, Park East, John F. Kennedy, Theodore Roosevelt, Morris, Alfred E. Smith, Aviation, Newtown, Adlai E. Stevenson, Louis D. Brandeis, Walton, Park West, Grace H. Dodge, University Heights, William H. Taft, DeWitt Clinton, Norman Thomas, and Queens Vocational High Schools.

7. See table entitled "Mathematics Achievement in NYC Elementary and Junior High Schools, 1991" in the Appendix.

8. See table titled "High Schools, Ranked by Concentration of Latino Students" in the Appendix.

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH/ANALYSIS ON THE CAUSES AND SOLUTIONS OF THE LATINO DROPOUT CRISIS.

The Dropout Committee aimed to review the literature in order to analyze causes and solutions directly associated with the disproportionately high Latino dropout rate; document with on-site surveys and specific case studies the causes and solutions to the dropout crisis; and advance specific recommendations to the Board of Education for the immediate and long-term curbing of the ongoing Latino dropout crisis.

The Committee's review of sociological and educational literature revealed an incredible array of correlates to the dropout phenomenon. These range from sociological issues related to class, race and gender to student variables such as boredom with irrelevant material, teen pregnancy, low grades and fear of violence. The review uncovered a dearth of student voices, especially in terms of the Latino dropout crisis. The perspective of Latino students themselves is rarely presented in educational and sociological literature. Thus, the central piece of our report is the examination and representation of Latino high school students' perspectives on the Latino dropout problem. This examination was constructed from a series of student surveys and interviews done by Latino college student researchers at Fordham University under the supervision of Professor Clara Rodriguez, Committee member. The research project was particularly useful in that it went beyond identifying why Latinos drop out to focus on the factors which encourage Latinos to stay in school and to complete their education.

The Committee's report is divided into two sections. The first section is a summary of Dr. Rodriguez's report on the Fordham Student Research Project. The complete version of this report, Student Voices, is being submitted as Volume Two of this Interim Report. The second section of this Committee's report provides our general recommendations in three categories: student-centered program issues, resource-allocation problems in relationship to community-based organizations and overall structural issues.

SUMMARY OF "STUDENT VOICES"

The following is a summary of the method, findings and recommendations of the research project that examined Latino high school students' perspectives on the Latino drop out problem. This study was conducted in conjunction with the Latino Commission and the Board of Education by Dr. Clara E. Rodriguez and the following students at Fordham University's, College At Lincoln Center: Laura Castillo, Carlos Cruz, Elizabeth Garcia, Mario Hyacinth, Cynthia A. Mustafa, Elizabeth Medina, Gillian Navarro, Marisol Parra, and Wilson Valentin. (A copy of this study is to be found in the Appendix.)

Method: Four large, zoned high schools with few selective programs and with substantial numbers of Latinos (23%-43%) were selected. Two of these high schools had high, and two had low, Latino dropout rates. Approximately 60 Latino students were interviewed and surveyed at each school. Students represented various academic levels, school grades and included LEP and non-LEP students.

Summary of Findings: Substantial differences were found between the two types of schools with regard to students' perception of the schools': school spirit, teachers and counselors' cultural sensitivity to Latinos, students' likes and dislikes, how students would change their schools, how different student racial groups get along, how schools handle university opportunities, and the extent to which schools encourage parental involvement. We also found that the schools do not differ substantially with regard to why students think Latinos drop out; how they view the school's handling of truancy and cutting of classes; and how Latino student groups got along.

Recommendations: The following recommendations are organized (1) according to the dimensions we examined in the schools and then (2) general recommendations are presented.

Why Latinos Drop Out

We recommend that schools with high Latino dropout rates address the issues raised by students in the schools we visited, concerning the lack of support and encouragement they perceive is given to Latino students to stay and do well in these schools.

We recommend that the Board of Education adopt, as a premise for future policy, that Latino students do not want to drop out. Further, that they investigate ways to prevent Latino dropout from occurring to the degree that it currently does.

Cultural Sensitivity

In view of the fact that we found cultural sensitivity is a plus, and, cultural insensitivity is a detriment to Latinos learning and staying in school, we recommend that the Board of Education implement a curriculum of inclusion that would not only be taught in the schools but that would also require teachers, counselors and administrators to learn about Latino cultures. This curriculum should address Latino cultures in the United States, as well as, in the different countries of origin.

In addition, and in the interim, neutrality toward cultural differences, combined with good teaching, should be stressed and implemented.

Implementing a curriculum of inclusion that stresses Latino cultures in equivalent fashion to other cultures should obviously include Latino staff. However, the staff should cross all racial and ethnic groups for, as we found, having a Latino cultural background was not sufficient by itself nor a requirement for cultural sensitivity.

We also recommended research into the following questions:

1. To what extent does the upper echelon of the school support and legitimate (a) cultural difference? (b) bilingual education?
2. What evidence is there of this support? (e.g., posters, special celebrations of different cultures, on-going cultural events)

Recommendations on "Spirit"

We found that the experience of many LEP students to be more positive than that of non-LEP students. Therefore, we recommend further research into the following questions:

1a. Is the experience of LEP students different from that of non-LEP students? Why?
1b. What is the role of bilingual education programs here?
2. Are non-LEP students are at higher risk than LEP students?
3. Will programs that provide external motivation for non LEP Latino students alter their academic success?
4. What other variables in addition to "school spirit" are important in creating positive learning environments for Latinos?
5. To what extent are Latino students encouraged or prevented from becoming involved in school activities (both academic and athletic) at various schools?

Recommendation on Race and Ethnic Relations

We found that in schools where the Latino dropout rate was low, race relations were more positive. We recommend more research to better ascertain the relationship of racial climates to the success and failure of Latinos in schools.

Recommendations Likes, Dislikes and Ideal Schools

Students made a number of specific recommendations at each of the schools. We recommend that these recommendations be addressed by the schools visited, but that these recommendations also be evaluated with an eye to seeing their applicability to other, similar schools.

We recommend that students be surveyed at all schools as a way of evaluating student needs.

Recommendations on University Access

We found that at those schools with high Latino dropout rates, students perceived differential access to college information -- depending on their racial or ethnic group. We recommend that this issue be investigated at these schools and at other, similar schools.

We also recommend investigation into whether Latino students in schools are being adequately informed about the various programs -- such as HEOP, SEEK, and other educational opportunity programs -- that have been established in private and public four-year institutions for students who are economically or educationally disadvantaged.

We recommend that all the schools, but particularly schools with high dropout rates develop liaison programs with universities to facilitate college enrollment.

Recommendations on Truancy and Cutting Class

The schools did not differ greatly in terms of how they handled truancy and cutting, yet there are significant differences between the schools with regard to dropout rates. We recommend further research into this area to ascertain why these dropout differentials persist.

We recommend that the schools address the difficulties raised by students in each school.

Recommendations on Parental Involvement

We recommend that schools survey parents in order to determine ways of bridging the gap between parents and schools.

We recommend that parents from the local community be aggressively recruited to work as school aids and in other positions at the high schools.

General Recommendations

In addition to the recommendations that flowed from the analysis, there were some particular recommendations made by the Fordham research group that are worthy of attention. They are listed in random order.

1. Cross-cultural courses should be introduced as a requirement in all high schools to bridge the gap between the different ethnic and racial groups in the school. This would yield advantages in two areas: (a) this would encourage independent study among students and (b) would fill a lack within the schools.

Currently students interested in learning about their own culture (or any culture that is not a part of the mandated requirements for graduation) have to depend on an extra curricular clubs or other sources. Having a knowledgeable department with guidelines for study may encourage students to participate in such studies and learn about their own cultures, as well as the cultures of other groups in their schools.

2. Schools should take seriously the teaching of Latino cultures and not just celebrate multiculturalism in the abstract.

3. It is important to develop more extra-curricular activities and to ensure Latino access to all school activities.

4. Safety also makes life easier. It is important to ensure safety in all of the schools and in the surrounding area.

5. Parents should be involved in school, not necessarily by attending all the school meetings, but by keeping a close eye on their child's attitude and activities, i.e., checking report cards, and attending parent/teacher night. It might also be useful to develop bilingual night programs that would be open to parents and students, wherein they could improve their work skills, e.g., computer courses, wordprocessing, ESL, workplace literacy, photography, etc. Day staff liaison should be available during these times, so parents could talk with them about their children.

6. There should be more security guards at some schools, but they should be better trained.

7. Students with economic disadvantages should be assisted economically so they don't drop out of high school, e.g., Coop programs and job training and placement programs that supplement academic programs.

8. Teachers should be made more sensitive to the situations and problems of their students.

9. Although a curriculum that stresses greater student independence was seen as a positive in our study, students also pointed out that it was important to be aware of the potential difficulties of implementing such programs in schools. Such independence can also be a *"double-edged sword; it can encourage development or it can result in confusion and falling through the cracks. Negative outcomes will occur when a student is isolated...a student may drop out of school because s/he has not found the right person to speak with in the school."*

10. With regard to School B and similar schools, more cultural awareness of Latino culture needs to be developed. Although some schools celebrate certain Latino holidays, and others have an entire week dedicated to Latino cultures, there does not seem to exist a commitment from the administration to Latino cultural difference in the school.

11. All schools should encourage Latinos to apply to a variety of public and private four year colleges.

12. Schools should place more emphasis on directing borderline students towards resource centers and places they can receive additional assistance.

13. Culture clubs should be added and encouraged at schools where they do not presently exist.

14. There is a great deal of awareness of violence and crime in public high schools today. However, there has been little attention paid to how particular schools became dangerous. We recommend that the question of how schools shifted from a safe environment to a climate of fear, violence and boredom be researched.

CALL FOR ACTION

In some ways, it is unusual that there are so few studies that ask students what they think of their educational experience; and fewer still that ask this of Latino students. This study has told us that Latinos at these schools "know the deal." They know when they are getting a good education and when they are not. They also have some pretty good ideas on how to improve education. This study has concluded that, in the case of Latino dropouts: schools make the difference. **The bottom line in this report is that: good neighborhoods or bad: good schools = success, bad schools = dropouts.**

This is an important finding and one we hope will be acted upon. Indeed, that is the main concern of all those who have been involved in the study. We have done this study out of a commitment to reduce Latino dropout and improve Latino education. Aside from the incentive that was provided to students for earning academic credit, no one involved with this research project received any direct compensation for their participation. An estimate of the costs that would have been incurred had this project been funded by a government or private foundation exceeds $100,00

This project was also not undertaken just for research purposes or idle academic curiosity. Indeed, the research agenda of the project director was seriously derailed in order to accommodate this research study. No, this project was done, at tremendous personal cost and sacrifice, because all of those involved wanted to see "something happen" -- the title of another study on Hispanic education. Throughout the process, there has been concern expressed that this not be "just another report" that will be filed for mere archival research. Even the high school students we spoke with wanted to know "what's going to be done about it?" We submit this report with the hope that these findings will not be overlooked, but will form the basis for thoughtful and aggressive action.

A: Student-Centered Programs and Issues

As the Committee's research project indicates, Latino students "know the deal". Latino students know when they are receiving a substandard education. Researchers maintain that there is a correlation between educational dissatisfaction, negative attitudes towards schooling, and dropping out.[1] An important message of Student Voices is that we cannot allow Latino children to be mired in curriculum which they consider irrelevant and unsatisfactory. The Board of Education must identify and replicate programs and pedagogical methodologies that are successful with and meaningful to Latino students. Such programs must affirm and validate the experience and backgrounds of Latino students, while equipping them with the necessary skills needed to ensure successful academic achievement and school completion. In order to do this, it is important that the Board take into consideration students' opinions of their educational experiences.

> **Recommendation #1:** The Board of Education should institutionalize an annual process of surveying students to elicit feedback and student input in the planning, design, development and evaluation of school and dropout program initiatives as well as of general curricula.

Schools must not only smoothly integrate Latino students into their social and academic development functions, but they must also take into account Latino students' need for a future vision. For, as research indicates, commitment to education and the expression of academic aspirations are important correlates of student school completion particularly for Latino students. As Teachers College

Professor Joseph Grannis concluded from his research of the New York City Dropout Prevention Initiative through 1988, "the area of educational and occupational expectations emerges as the one that is most likely to be associated with Hispanic students' subsequent rates of completing school."[2] Thus, the Board of Education should conduct longitudinal research on Latino students' level of motivation, interest in school, and vision for the future in order to evaluate the impact of these factors on retention and completion rates at the elementary-, middle- and secondary-school levels. This longitudinal research, like the Board's annual Cohort dropout study, should collect data by race, gender and subgroup within the Latino category.

Furthermore, the Board should examine the degree to which predominantly-Latino schools currently implement reform models increasingly used in New York City, such as Henry Levin's "Accelerated Schools" and Theodore Sizer's "Coalition of Essential Schools".

An unknown number of Puerto Rican and Dominican students do not live permanently in the continental United States. Communication between the New York City public schools and these island public schools must be institutionalized in order to ensure "educational success" and school retention, at least for these two largest Latino groups in New York City.

> **Recommendation #2:** The Board of Education should consistently report measures of Latino students' success which are tied to issues of economic security and occupational opportunity and grounded in the real-life experiences of Latino students. Furthermore, the Board must set specific goals that target performance outcomes for Latino students in the problem areas, i.e.: (x)

dropout rate reduction by year (y); (x) degree of mastery/achievement in math and science by year (y).

Recommendation #3: The Board should not only acknowledge the lack of linkage between NYC, Dominican and Puerto Rican island schools but also should develop a plan to initiate and institutionalize such linkages. A review of the "Educational Passport Program" initiated under Chancellor Nathan Quinones is needed in order to determine the status of its implementation and the feasibility of its adaptation to the Dominican Republic.

B: Resource Allocation

Often, students who end up leaving school feel that their community and reality is not at all related to their school experience. Indeed, the findings of the Five Cities High School Dropout Study undertaken by the Aspira National Association, Inc. support the need for explicit linkages between the schools and Latino communities (also, see sections in this Interim Report on Counseling and Support Services; Parent and Community Empowerment and Factors). These linkages are seen as benefiting both institutions, while also improving educational outcomes for Latino students. Specifically, Latino community-based organizations (CBO's) are needed to provide services that the schools have traditionally not been able to offer. Key components of these services include, among others, efforts to build linguistic and cultural bridges between home and school.

Yet funding problems eliminate innovative Latino CBO programs, slowly and systematically, from the school system, regardless of their success (e.g., the ASPIRA High School Leadership Club Model). This desperate situation will only get worse unless the state legislature specifically targets the needs of Latino, or at least LEP youths, when authorizing categorical funds.

The fact is that community-based programs are severely underfunded when compared with similar programs within the schools. Overall, the nonprofit community is in a squeeze play. Demand on nonprofit services is steadily climbing, especially on direct-service organizations, while funding for those services is steadily declining. As nonprofit organizations have been moving to fill these gaps within the school system-- with after-school programs, family counseling efforts, leadership programs, and other dropout prevention initiatives-- these organizations have had to add to their overloaded agendas the tasks of fighting cuts and raising new private dollars. The net results are less services for an increasingly needy public and greater organizational distress for Latino CBO's. In sum, there is an urgent need to create a more adequate funding structure to ensure the stabilization and survival of programs that help Latino children.

Duplication of services benefiting the same children has become another significant issue in the Board of Education's bureaucracy. For example, some Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (AIDP) funds are administered through the United Way and others are funneled in through the school system. Yet, both often serve the same exact children in an identical manner.

The great potential for duplication of services is verified by the experiences of both Latino and non-Latino subcontracted organizations. The nexus of the problem lies in the absence of information about external contracted services in the public schools. When we examine the array of programs in any given school, we can assume that services--whether supportive or instructional in nature-- are directed to "at- risk" youth. Although, clearly each program draws upon and intends to serve a segment of the larger school population. Potentially, a school can have resources from foundations, corporate contributors, federal, state or city agencies, universities and community-based organizations. For effective and meaningful collaborations to take place, the entire orientation of services must be assessed within the context of a comprehensive service model. Consideration must also be given to the enormous and complex task of organizing and coordinating these services in a fluid, adaptable and sustained manner.

In the midst of this, the projected increases in the growth of the Latino population far out-distances current projections of service-provision to Latinos. Issues of culture, as well as language, make a compelling case for compatibility between service recipients and service providers.

We commend the New York City Board of Education on the recent progress it has made to ensure greater representation of Latino community-based organizations. Unfortunately, while these actions have led to a significant increase in the level of Latino participation, resource allocation has increased only moderately. AIDP funding within the high schools shows minimal growth, though there are more Latino community-based organizations participating.

While the number of Latino organizations providing dropout prevention services to New York City schools has increased, the funding levels remain inadequate and cannot ensure programmatic success. The New York City Board of Education must continue to support gains made by Latino community-based organizations in the 1991-1992 fiscal year in terms of AIDP contracts.

> **Recommendation 4:** The Board of Education must seek new and creative funding schemes in contract awards that target school retention and dropout prevention initiatives for Latino students. The Board should explore and introduce legislative reform initiatives in the New York State Assembly in regard to categorical funding streams that will create multi-year funding patterns for CBO's based on annualized assessments of CBO services. This will not only ensure non-duplication, but will also facilitate the grounding and stabilization of community programs.

> **Recommendation 5:** The Board of Education and public schools should have central sources of current information available to the members of the school and CBO communities as well as the general public regarding funded program services. This information, where applicable, should be categorized and made available to all parties involved in school/CBO planning and delivery of services. The Board should also aggressively market these services to the student population, school staff and the parent community prior to the implementation of any new service relationships with external organizations.

C: Structural Issues

In addition to creating a more equitable resource allocation scheme for Latino CBO's, the Board of Education can make structural changes to increase the extent to which Latino CBO's can become part of the solution to the dropout crisis. For example, the Board has stringent contracting requirements that call for each CBO employee in direct contact with school children to undergo a security-clearance process that can take from 8-16 weeks. We support the Board of Education's legal requirement to ensure the safety of our school children. However, we need to examine the impact this process has on contracted services and on the limited resources of Latino CBO's. CBO's cannot make hiring decisions until funding is secured and it is difficult to recruit and retain staff through the prolonged period of clearance. Schools are unduly affected by the limited role that CBO's can play in the first few months of the school year, a critical period of time when schools are struggling to stabilize the attendance of students.

CBO's and schools are further hampered by implementation delays because the collaborative services are planned and designed around the 10-month school calendar.

The Board of Education must consider partial or total reduction of fees that each CBO must pay for employees undergoing security clearance. AIDP funds flow from the State to the New York City Board of Education for distribution to CBO's. CBO's must then pay $67.50 per employee to the New York State Division of Criminal Justice, another state entity. Although the amount seems insignificant, we must take into account employee attrition, the minimal resources Latino CBO's receive, and a plummeting administrative cap on AIDP CBO subcontractors.

> **Recommendation #6:** The New York City Board of Education should dedicate staffing and create a process that facilitates bureaucratic response during critical start-up periods. Moreover, the Board should provide waivers or partial reduction of fingerprinting fees for CBO's.

Other structural concerns pertain to the institutionalization of class, race, gender and language discrimination. First and foremost, the heterogeneity of the Latino people must be recognized. Indeed the conscious or unconscious denial of any facet of what can be labeled the Latino reality only creates more "invisible people", more racial tension. The fact that Spanish is perceived as a low-status language does not help Latino-LEP students and families who are trying to enter into the mainstream of our city. The dropout rate of young Latinas, juxtaposed with their high rates of teen pregnancy and childbearing, undeniably make their needs worthy of distinctive and sustained attention.[3]

> **Recommendation #7:** The Board and all the schools must acknowledgement and eliminate the obstacles to Latino students' success. Institutional inequities founded on class, race and gender bias have to be acknowledged and attacked.

Our community is willing and needs to become part of the solution to the Latino dropout crisis. We know that many of the effective prevention strategies suggested by the research point to the need for a strong community presence in the schools that our children attend. Our students need to be heard, our organizations need a fair of public resources, and the structural obstacles that so often lead our youth to drop out need to be attacked.

-NOTES-

1.James S. Catterall "A Process Model of Dropping Out of School: Implications for Research and Policy in an Era of Raised Academic Standards." (Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1986) p.16.

2.Grannis, Joseph Evaluation of the New York City Dropout Prevention Initiative, 1987-88, Final Longitudinal Report, January 22, 1990, p. 39.

3. Luis Duany and Karen Pittman, Latino Youths at A Crossroads (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fun) January/March 1990, p. 30.

COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Contrary to common stereotypes, most Latino students are not enrolled in bilingual education programs. Three in four of them are enrolled in monolingual educational programs. No matter where they lie in the language continuum from Spanish monolingual to fully bilingual to non-Spanish-speaking, Latino students need to have access to high-quality curricular and instructional initiatives. Often, these students' lack of access to advanced academic programs serves as the most direct explanation for the fact that Latino students as a group do not seem to achieve at high academic levels. As explained in Volume II of this Interim Report, Student Voices, Latino students see dropping out "as representing a failure, a problem" and they "do not want to drop out." Students want to stay in school, but they long for the schools to communicate that they care through strengthened interpersonal relationships with teachers and other school personnel, through safer school environments, and through pertinent and high quality instructional programs.

Even though New York City student achievement data is not yet available for specific ethnic groups, we know that Latino students not only have a higher dropout rate, but that the achievement scores for those that are in school are below those of other students in the system. In 1991, all ten community-school districts with the highest concentration of Latino students had high proportions of students reading and performing in math below grade level.[1] At the national level, Puerto Rican students--who comprise about half of the New York City student population--are twice as likely to perform below basic level in mathematics by the time they are in the eighth grade.[2] Their performance is not so surprising when one considers that this same study--The National Longitudinal Survey of 1988--shows that Puerto Rican students are almost half as likely (19 percent, compared with 34 percent for white students) to be exposed to advanced mathematics by the eighth grade. This early disadvantage undermines Latino students' efforts to build upon prior math competency in the high school.

In New York City high schools, less than one-third of the Latino students are enrolled in sequential math, which exposes students to college-preparatory material. Furthermore, according to Board of Education data, Latino students in UAPC high schools[3] are half as likely as white students to be enrolled in advanced-math courses: only 5.7 percent of Latino students, compared to 10.1 percent of whites, 5.1 percent of Blacks, 9.9 percent of Native Americans, and 22 percent of Asians, take these advanced math courses.

Although the Committee has focused on four specific areas--including this low mathematical achievement--within the vast realms of curriculum and instruction, it is important to view this report in the context of the growing school-restructuring movement. Important curricular and instructional initiatives, such as school-based decision-making about instruction, multicultural education, alternative assessment, and cooperative learning rarely address the interests or needs of Latino students. Yet the inner-city schools in greatest need of these innovative programs are those attended by low-income Latino students and other children of color.

---

[1] These are districts 6, 1, 32, 14, 7, 12, 10, 4, 9, and 8. See Appendices on Community School Districts Ranked by Concentration of Latino Students.

[2] See De La Rosa, Denise and Carlyle Maw, Hispanic Education: A Statistical Portrait, National Council of La Raza, 1990, p. 31.

[3] These are high schools which are part of a computerized network of the Board of Education.

Indeed, the national educational initiatives mentioned above need to be implemented in the New York City schools where Latino students are concentrated. At the same time, the Board of Education needs to formulate, implement, and fully support targeted local initiatives for this growing population. The Committee has examined several areas related to curriculum and instruction where new local initiatives would create culturally appropriate models of academic success for Latinos. These models must acknowledge the Latino historical experience as inclusive of Indigenous, African, and Asian roots, and must use this "encuentro de culturas" (encounter between cultures) in our experience as a basis for developing cross-cultural understanding among inner-city students.

In addition, these initiatives should also address often-forgotten means through which students can be prepared for a democratic society: leadership development, community service, and social action. Given the social issues facing our communities today, we expect these initiatives to directly address the racial conflict, growing poverty, and enormous environmental problems that threaten the flourishing of our communities. Our youth need to be exposed to programs that show them the number of ways in which our communities depend on their leadership.

Yet while models for Latino excellence need to be created in particular schools, all schools with a significant population of Latino students need to have access to intensive staff development opportunities and other resources targeted for low-achieving community school districts and high schools. Teacher turnover data by district is still in the process of being collected by the Board's Office of Personnel on behalf of the Latino Commission. The Committee feels strongly that pedagogical initiatives must be accompanied by efforts to ensure a stable and informed staff that can focus on the educational needs of Latino students.

It is in this context that the Committee has focused on four general areas for this Interim Report:

* a proposed system-wide Latino Educational Reform Initiative
* a proposal for a new Latino Leadership School
* the problems and opportunities presented by the low mathematics achievement of Latino students, and
* issues of quality in bilingual education.

During the next year, the Committee intends to look more carefully at areas that include early literacy development, assessment and tracking, and special education.

Proposal I: The Latino Educational Reform Initiative

In the Student Voices, in Volume II of this Interim Report, the students note that "school spirit" which connotes high morale and feelings of satisfactions is directly related to dropout rates in the school. Usually environments with strong "school spirits" are created by catalysts such as teacher groups who work to improve their school environment, parent groups who demand a better education for their children, or a charismatic educational leader or principal of the school building. A system-wide curricular initiative based on this experience should be instituted to foster locally developed concepts of school restructuring. It should create the spaces and provide the resources for efforts that exemplary groups have undertaken, while also creating incentives for new efforts. This Initiative would be based on knowledge of the literature on the education of Latino students and would echo some of the student voices reflected in Volume II with respect to cultural sensitivity and parental involvement. Thus, the Initiative would broaden the definition of educational success while focusing on improvement of the schooling experience of Latinos. This initiative would be based, structurally and procedurally, on the "Corridor Initiative" and focused on the needs of all Latino children.

Goal

The overall goal of the Latino Educational Reform Initiative is to improve the educational experience of Latinos (Pre-kindergarten through 12th grade) in the New York City Public

Schools. More specifically, it should stimulate and initiate model programs focused on curtailing the well-documented academic failure and dropout rates of Latino students. The Initiative should lead to the development of programs that create high-quality environments for success (Nieto, 1992) by promoting:

*__instructional practices__ that (a) are creative and foster critical thinking, (b) are rooted in socio-cultural and linguistic knowledge, (c) promote cross-cultural understanding, and (d) communicate a sense of caring and high expectations.

*__governance structures__ that are more inclusive of the Latino community and are organized around (a) Latino parent-and-teacher partnerships, (b) collaboration between schools and Latino community-based organizations, and (c) school cooperative ventures that benefit the Latino student and community.

*__extracurricular activities__ that (a) are supportive in sustaining Latino students' interest in school, community and home life, (b) present alternatives to negative peer pressures and (c) promote a sense of belonging.

Structure & Process

The Initiative will be based on competition between school programs that apply. School districts and high school superintendencies will submit proposals that (a) evaluate the needs of their district/school vis-a-vis the improvement of the educational experiences of Latinos and (b) take a comprehensive and systemic view of the most appropriate responses to the needs identified.

The focus of the programs should be in at least three of the following areas:

- development of a model of multicultural education that affirms racial, cultural and linguistic diversity, while also promoting attitudes of tolerance, acceptance, respect, affirmation, solidarity, and critique (Nieto, 1992)
- bilingual instructional policies that foster pride in and maintenance of Spanish and that recognize the variation in language and cultural forms
- program and curriculum development that focuses on promoting biliteracy as a foundation for this multilingual world
- revision of curriculum so as to reflect non-discriminatory, anti-sexist postures incorporating the contributions and visions of young and old, rich and poor, and all the peoples and ethnicities which comprise and contribute to all sectors of the U.S. as a nation.
- development of a curriculum that promotes learning for a diverse range of present and future career opportunities
- joint revision of curriculum and staff development that focus on building instruction that grounds pedagogy and curriculum content to the life experience of students and their community
- staff development and program changes that fosters the integration of bilingual, mainstream, and special educational practices
- staff development programs that focus on promoting cross-cultural understanding among staff, parents, and/or students
- program and curriculum development that focuses on promoting the educational experience in the areas of math and science

- development of instructional and extracurricular programs that increase student skills and opportunities to solve problems, make decisions, and become involved in community service
- parental involvement that fosters environments of success
- creation of student leadership-development programs that explicitly address the issues of language, culture, and community linkages

Monies will be sought from public and private sources to fund planning and implementation grants. The planning grants will be awarded to schools in order to enable them to design and institute a decision-making process that truly empowers teachers, parents, and others in the community to create programs that are tailored to the unique needs of Latino children and the interest of the local Latino community. During this planning period, a fundamental goal will be to design a process by which all parties involved with the targeted students feel ownership of the proposed project. The implementation grants will have an associated documentation process aimed at describing the program and identifying the successful aspects of the program which can be replicated and implemented elsewhere. Indeed, this duplication factor will be a key component of the implementation stage.

Proposal II: The Latino Leadership School

In addition to recommending the Latino Initiative on Educational Reform which allows for local flexibility in creating system-wide, Latino-focused, and replicable models, the Committee feels that there is a need for creating a small high school of 700 seventh to twelfth graders based on the ASPIRA model, as has been done in Chicago and Miami. This open-enrollment high school should serve as a model both for the education of Latino students and for the effective implementation of curricula that facilitates multi-ethnic understanding.

The proposal envisioned by the Committee could mesh with the Chancellor's New Visions Schools, and indeed members of the Committee will work to create a proposal to the Aaron Diamond Foundation for that initiative.

The fact is that, too often, bright Latino students are attending second-rate, uninspiring high schools where they are not exposed to high-quality curricula. They must be offered the option of enrolling in a demanding academic institution that also responds to their cultural needs.

Given these needs, the Latino Leadership School will have three overarching goals:

1. To provide a rigorous academic program that will prepare all students for college.
2. To create a model of professional practice around educational issues which are of major import to Latino students.
3. To become a focal point for the involvement of the larger Latino community in school reform efforts.

Specifically, we believe the school should be committed to:

1. Effective implementation of the New York City Board of Education's language policy of bilingualism through a dual-language program, which would ensure high levels of

Spanish and English mastery by all students, Latinos and non-Latinos.

2. Development and implementation of curricula--ultimately resulting in Latino-focused curricular materials for the rest of the system--which are sensitive and responsive to the cultural needs of Latino students.
3. Development and implementation of a student leadership program based on the ASPIRA model. This would be one of the ways in which the students would learn to appreciate the wealth of community resources and the need for youth to make their contribution to those resources.
4. Development and implementation of a vigorous academic program characterized by intellectual inquiry and creative expression. As in the Coalition of Essential Schools, critical thinking skills would be stressed throughout the curricula. Students would be saturated with exposure to higher education opportunities.
5. Development and implementation of a community service program providing opportunities for students to engage in policy issues and social actions relevant to the Latino community.
6. Implementation of a multidisciplinary strategy that weaves in the different historical and cultural contributions of the diverse Latino cultures.
7. Exposing students to opportunities for academic travel abroad, including Puerto Rico, through--for example-- Dr.

Antonia Pantoja's (Aspira's founder) summer program there.

As stated in the second overarching goal, the school would serve as a model for the rest of the school system with its innovative curricular and instructional strategies for Latino students. It would function under an extended-day model, and would provide time for staff planning, in order to allow for the innovative, interdisciplinary strategies expected to take place at the School. Documenting these strategies is an important part of creating the model, and the Committee strongly recommends that the Latino Leadership School be affiliated with a major college's school of education to assist the Leadership School in:

* creating networks of teachers, administrators, parents, and schools to hold professional dialogue on issues having a strong impact on the education of Latino students
* providing intensive staff-development experiences
* developing and disseminating curricular materials
* becoming a clearinghouse for pertinent research and successful professional practices
* creating collaborative models between licensed teachers and student teachers
* assisting in the development of alternative assessment practices, especially as they relate to inner-city students

In order to address the third overarching goal of community involvement, the Committee proposes the establishing of an advisory committee of students, parents, business, community representatives and friends of the school who, in turn, would create a structure for involving the larger Latino community. Among other strategies, the School could involve the Latino community through:

- opportunities for mentoring by elders and other members of the community;
- job placement with community-based employers as well as internships with large corporations in the area, and
- cultural activities in collaboration with community-based organizations which could take place in the school and at other community sites.

Finally, and no less importantly, students in the Latino Leadership School--regardless of their academic achievement--will need support services at the school and community. The School must create a supportive environment that draws the community, public agencies, and private resources into a safety net through which none of the youth from the school can fall. In this vein, the School will have advisory or "family" groups each morning where teachers serve as counselors, in addition to their instructional role.

In general, then, the Latino Leadership School will use this model developed by the Puerto Rican/Latino community to expose Latino high-school students to challenging curricula, to develop leadership committed to social action for the future of the community, and to demonstrate the excellence that can be reached in a bilingual setting that places high value on the Spanish language.

Proposal III. Beyond the Consent Decree

1. Strengthening the Quality of Bilingual Programs

The goal of bilingual literacy and biculturalism is essential for the success of Latino students. Addressing the language and cultural aspects of programs, however, is not enough, the nature and quality of these are equally if not more important.

Bilingual education becomes effective only when it becomes anti-racist, when relationships of collaboration and partnership with linguistically different communities are developed, when the pedagogy is organized so as to create critical thinkers and active participants, and when assessments focus on the value and resources students bring into the classroom.[4] The development of a quality bilingual/multicultural program embodies the "beliefs of tolerance, acceptance, respect, affirmation, solidarity and critique" (p.276).[5] It develops the human relations skills needed in interpersonal and intergroup relations, with special emphasis on those necessary for dealing with conflicts arising from bias and discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, gender, age, sexual orientation and/or handicapping condition. Furthermore, it aims to develop a vision for social transformation.[6]

How then does a program strive for and achieve these important elements? How do we change the structure of bilingual education to ensure a quality and successful educational experience for all the children? And, how do we move towards and evaluate what is embodied in this vision? How do we ensure that bilingual teachers have the appropriate attitudes, knowledge, and skills to incorporate the student's and community's language, culture, and lived experiences as part and parcel of effective pedagogy to create the conditions that motivate students to learn, to become critical thinkers, and to develop social action skills? How do we ensure that the bilingual teachers have the support and training required to be successful educators? How do we assess student growth while avoiding its usual tracking and labeling functions? How do we build bilingual learning environments that promote multicultural education as a comprehensive philosophy of education? How do we ensure home environments for success?

---

[4] "Empowering Language Minority Students," Cummins, 1986.

[5] Nieto, S., Affirming Diversity: The Socio-political Context of Multicultural Education. White Plains: Longman, 1992.

[6] "Making Education Multicultural," Document prepared by Chancellor Fernandez' Multicultural Advisory Board

To ensure a quality bilingual/multicultural educational program, many factors must be considered individually and in interaction with each other. The Curriculum & Instruction Committee felt that emphasis must be placed on strengthening the quality of existing programs. With this goal in mind, we examined the areas of language policy, evaluation & assessment, parent involvement, and staff development.

We also felt that dual language program structures be considered as models for they can integrate some of the quality components with which we are concerned.

Language Policy

While the Commission applauds the Board's initial language policy supporting dual language proficiency for all students of February 1987 and its Policy on the Education of LEP Students of 1990, it must also be critical of its continued implementation of models that are characterized by inconsistent classroom language use practices and are structurally compensatory, remedial, and deficit-based. The lack of a policy based on bilingualism as desirable and enriching sets the framework for district/school implementation that is inconsistent and falls prey to the ebb and flow of the political climate rather than responding to the pedagogical and developmental needs of children. The lack of a consistent language policy has set a framework (a) where implementation is based on the teacher's own definition of bilingual education (b) where evaluation of program success is measured by the rapidity with which students are exited; (c) where programs lack clarity about their educational goals and objectives; and (d) where negative public and parent perceptions about the quality of programs prevails. The end results, needless to say, are program ineffectiveness, teacher frustration, and most importantly, less than quality education for our children.

The inconsistency between the Board's language policy and the actual practice also has implications for assessment, evaluation, and staff development.

Assessment

Bilingual programs, like all social phenomena, do not exist in isolation. Rather, they respond to the needs of particular students in specific contexts.[7] The sole reliance on student achievement measures to assess student progress and program effectiveness is inappropriate. Assessments have traditionally resulted in the disabling and tracking of Latino students and have served to mask the social and organizational realities in which school achievement is accomplished.

The Committee felt that authentic and alternative ways of assessing native language proficiency, subject matter competency, and student progress in general are critical. Assessments should provide schools with information about the language and learning needs of students so that the appropriate learning environments can be provided to maximize student success. This will require new assessment practices. The field of education is increasingly embracing alternative assessments and the complexity of bilingual education calls for serious consideration of these alternative methods. The Committee notes that the Board should be prepared both for changes in assessment practices and drastic changes in curriculum, instructional practices, and staffing patterns that may be triggered by these assessments.

Evaluation

A variety of factors must be examined when evaluating programs; there are both program and contextual variables. The contextual variables are those related to community, school/district, and broader society. They are important because they frequently drive and mediate success/failure outcomes.[8] Some of the critical questions evaluations of bilingual/bicultural education must consider are:

---

[7] "Beyond the Classroom: The Context for Bilingual Education in New York," Torres, J.S, Bilingual Education: Using Language for Success. Carrasquillo, A.L., Ed., 1991.

> What is the attitude towards the language minority community? Is there adequate funding? Are the resources and instructional materials adequate? What is the actual bilingual methodology being used? What is the level of parent involvement and school-community relations? Is there a supportive school climate? Are the students' health, housing, and social service needs being adequately met? Is the bilingual staff provided with appropriate and on-going staff development? What bilingual support staff is available? What is the public perception of bilingual education? How is the restrictive language movement to make English the official language affecting the public perceptions of decision-makers?

The critical program variables that have an impact on educational outcomes are:

1) Attitudes towards Spanish and bilingual programs

   How is the native language used in instruction? Is Spanish considered an asset or a deficit? Are students experiencing hostility and marginalization? Is there student pride in language and culture or negative internalization? Is there tolerance or rejection of language variety? What is the instructional policy on the use of code switching?

2) Pedagogy

   Is the teacher using the language, culture, and experiences of students? Is there active participation and student engagement? What is the level of problem posing and critical thinking? Do instructional styles account for Latino diversity?

3) Curriculum

   To what extent is the classroom environment and organization of instruction inclusive of social interactions found in the communities students come from? Is the environment conducive to learning? Is the curriculum multicultural? Does it include Latino history and culture? What do the textbooks and audio visuals tell us? Do the teachers take part in the design and development? Are they involved in decisions regarding the purchasing of educational materials?

---

[8] Ogbu & Matuti-Bianchi.....1986.

4) Accountability and Decision Making

Are there clear lines of accountability between the bilingual teacher, school principal, bilingual coordinator, and the Division of Bilingual Education? Are there clear lines of communication between these units and the Office of Monitoring and School Improvement and the Office of Research Evaluation and Assessment? What impact do competing demands have on what happens in the classrooms? What is level of accountability to parents? Are teachers involved in decisions affecting program direction?

5) Parent Involvement in Bilingual Programs

Are Latino parents present in the school or classroom? Are they active in school governance? Are they involved in teacher/parent/community collaborative projects? Are parents supported in and encouraged to develop pride in the use of the native language and in fostering respect for cultural values? Are they encouraged to maintain open channels of communication with their children and with the school? How are parents involved as community and instructional resources?

Teacher Education , Staff Development and Leadership Preparation.

Given the important role teacher education and staff development plays in determining the quality of schooling for Latino students, it is imperative to pay particular attention to developing more effective bilingual and monolingual teacher preparation programs and rethinking the nature of existing staff development within the public school system. To be sure, programs that prepare individuals for roles in leadership positions within schools must also undergo major transformation.

Teacher education and educational administration programs need to reorient their focus to the critical transformation of public schools rather than to the simple reproduction of existing institutions and ideologies.[9] As schools move toward organizational restructuring, so too must the conceptualization of teaching and learning change. Schools must organize optimal school environments that promote and value the language, culture, family, and community of the Latino students and broaden their perspectives on the world. The school environment must challenge the students to understand the value of multiple perspectives and to examine their identities, their beliefs, and their actions within a broader global perspective.

To achieve this, teachers and principals must be adequately prepared. As this city becomes increasingly multilingual and multicultural, the challenge becomes even greater and the institutions, including the Board, which have historically prepared the pedagogical and administrative staffs of the public school system, must redefine their roles so as to better fulfill this responsibility.

In developing high quality bilingual programs, bilingual educators and administrators need to be supported, respected, and provided with cutting edge understandings in bilingual/multicultural education, second language learning, bilingual special education, and educational pedagogy. They need opportunities for enhancing and enriching their knowledge, for developing state of the art teaching and leadership strategies, and for developing more effective strategies for working with parents.

---

[9] "Barriers to Excellence: Our Children at Risk," National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1985.

* A Bilingual-Multicultural Institute designed as a university-school collaborative focused on the professional development of bilingual teachers and administrators is long overdue. Such an institute must:

1. develop mentoring relationships between novice and seasoned bilingual teachers and between monolingual and bilingual teachers;

2. it must encourage staff development and research collaborations between teachers and university faculty on classroom practices and school restructuring;

3. it must foster reflective practitioners and encourage bilingual teachers to tell their stories and the lessons learned from these;

4. it must prepare teachers to undertake the task of helping student and community voices flow through and beyond their classrooms;

5. it must encourage teachers to integrate community funds of knowledge with instructional programs;

6. it must encourage teachers to undertake interdisciplinary work and develop integrated curricula; and

7. it must encourage a spirit of innovation in the classroom which is inclusive of learning experiences beyond the school walls.

The Institute must also address the need to develop administrators who facilitate the education of all children and ensure safe and caring environments for teachers, students, and communities to take risks in their collaborative educational ventures. And, ultimately, it must encourage universities to restructure teacher preparation programs to share in the responsibility of leadership of developing more successful environments for the ever-growing population of Latino students.

Furthermore, the Board must articulate the need to develop Bilingual/Multicultural Strands within the principals' training institutes that are underway in such institutions as Bank Street, Teachers College, and others as well as to insist that all future institutes of this type incorporate this as an essential part of its program.

On Parent Involvement

The importance of Latino parent involvement has been underscored throughout this document. The Curriculum & Instruction Committee feels that a major effort has to be undertaken to bring together parents of students in Bilingual Programs who are committed to bilingual education and who could serve as spokespersons and as a resource to parents of children in the programs.

- To this end, we are recommending that a Latino Bilingual Parents Commission be constituted representing the diversity of the Latino community and the different programs within bilingual education. The Commission would serve as a vehicle for Latino parents of students in bilingual programs and would assure that Latino parents are provided with adequate information about bilingual and special education. It would also assist in the planning of parent conferences and the development of information to parents about bilingual/multicultural education and special education.

2. Dual Language Program Model

New York State and New York City policies have as a goal the development of bilingual proficiency in all students. This language policy goes far beyond the minimal constraints found in the Consent Decree and under which the New York City school system provides bilingual/ESL services to limited English proficient students of which approximately 80,000 are Latino.

The eight year government funded study on bilingual education[10] found that when the children are taught in their native language for a longer period of time, their growth curves in mathematics, English language, and reading skills not only grow as fast or faster than the "at-risk" general population. This was not found to be true of early exit, transitional nor English immersion programs. Various state evaluations confirm that late exit programs are more educationally sound than early exit, transitional programs. The dual language programs fall within the category of late exit programs.

---

[10] Ramirez, et al., 1991

The dual language model promotes bilingualism/ biliteracy by integrating English speakers and Spanish speakers in one classroom. It allows participants to learn each other's language, but, more importantly, Spanish is seen as a viable language that enjoys equal status with English. The programs, thus, exist within a school environment that is both supportive and protective. The teachers embrace the complexity of the program without the additional burden of constantly having to defend what they do. Because it is a program of excellence, language minority and mainstream parents support it. This support helps strengthen school-community linkages.

The instruction is in two languages and the languages are kept separate. The language of instruction alternates by the half-day or alternate day and through a variety of staffing arrangements. The burden of unidirectional bilingualism is lifted for the language minority child. No longer is the language minority child singled out as the one who does not succeed because he or she does not understand the language. Both the language minority child and the English speaking child struggle together as they learn each other's language while learning subject matter. Each child is able to not only access knowledge more readily, but also to develop a more positive self-esteem through successful experiences. Going through the process ensures that all students become more proficient bilinguals. Understanding the process predisposes the students to helping each other and lessens the social stigmas associated with second language learning.[11]

Because the dual language model is inclusive of mainstream student populations, an equitable distribution of financial and human resources is more likely to be advocated by the parents of the children who participate than when the program is designed exclusively for language minority children. This benefits the language minority child, but raises another equity concern. It is important that these programs avoid catering to the white middle class parents who want their children to learn a second language at the expense of the children who do not speak English. No child who possesses limited English proficiency should remain in monolingual English classrooms because of lack of space, insufficient funds, or school philosophy.

3. The articulation of Board policy through the media

The most recent attack on bilingual education ("The Bilingual Ghetto," by Stephanie Gutmann, in the Winter 1992 issue of The City Journal, from the Manhattan Institute) is neither surprising nor unusual. It is one more example of how the media kow-tows to the misinformed and unsubstantiated opinions of opponents of bilingual education. We are not opposed to informed debate nor scholarly pursuits that question critical assumptions, what we are opposed to is the endless onslaught and misinformation.

---

[11] Torres-Guzman, M., "Response to the Montgomery County Public Schools Evaluation on Minority Achievement," 1990.

To this end:

* We believe it essential that a well-thought out, creative and aggressive media and public relations campaign be developed. This campaign must articulate the Board's philosophy in ways that will be better understood by the different "publics" it must address, including the parents of children who would most benefit from the programs. To target vigorously the parents of language minority children, as well as parents in general needs to occur in a language that is accessible to them.

* We also believe the campaign must direct itself to Central Board staff and Community School Districts. It is appalling to find so many misinformed personnel.

4. Bilingual Teacher Shortage & Salary Differential

According to the Summary of Findings in the October 1991 Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment Report, "A Pilot Study of Services to Students of Limited English Proficiency in New York City Public Schools," administrators in the 21 sample schools surveyed considered bilingual education to be the area of greatest teacher shortage. While the Board has stepped up its recruitment efforts in New York, the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic, this is still not adequate to meet the pressing need. Recruitment procedures need to be evaluated further.

- The Board should immediately review and monitor the recruitment procedures to:
  1. ensure that bilingual teachers and other bilingual personnel who apply and meet the qualifications requirements are placed quickly and appropriately;
  2. ensure that the recommendations on recruitment from the Working Group on Latino Educational Opportunity are appropriately implemented; and
  3. determine whether the Puerto Rico recruitment efforts have been successful or if the money is best spent strengthening the collaboration and outreach efforts with CUNY, in the paraprofessional career ladder program, and the Richard Green High School for Teaching.

By providing salary differentials for bilingual skills, the Board will be able to attract more and better qualified candidates to the bilingual education profession. Salary differentials are usually provided when teachers complete a certain amount of credits in a given area or obtain another degree. Salaries for bilingual teachers and bilingual special education teachers should reflect the additional credential requirements in bilingual and special education and the differentiated skills that are required.

A precedent for this has been set with the Los Angeles Bilingual/ESL teachers. The Los Angeles School System's and the United Teachers of Los Angeles' collective bargaining agreement provides for the payment of stipends and differentials to employees assigned to programs servicing LEP students. They are intended to help the district recruit and retain qualified teachers of LEP students and as an incentive for employees to upgrade their qualifications and to accept or volunteer for assignments in Bilingual/ESL programs.

Additional Recommendations:

The previous narrative and recommendations and the following additional recommendations are aimed at going beyond the minimum of the Consent Decree in order to develop instructional and school environments leading to improved academic achievement for Latino students.

1. The Board must require that all teacher training institutions (BS, MS) require, for credentialing, that monolingual as well as bilingual teacher education students demonstrate an understanding and knowledge of second language acquisition, multicultural education, bilingual special education and the ability to work with immigrant children and Latino parents before receiving their credentials. Prospective bilingual teachers should demonstrate communicative competency in Spanish and demonstrate competency in techniques in ESL.

2. The Board should require State Certification as Bilingual Supervisor which would enhance the position and the program by elevating it to cabinet status on the District level. This would

assure advocacy for the needs of Latino language minority children within bilingual programs or in monolingual classes. Bilingual staff would be provided clear and direct supervision as well as educational and administrative leadership and provided clear articulation between Central, the district and the schools. The Board should work with such institutions as Bank Street, CUNY, and Teachers College to develop a degree program in bilingual supervision and administration and offer a fellowship as an incentive.

3. The Board should immediately develop a clear statement of mission and definition of roles for the Division of Bilingual Education in order to set the highest standards for bilingual education. The Division must be adequately funded and staffed and strategies must be developed for its short range and long range functioning. The articulation between the Division and the Office of Monitoring and School Improvement must be strengthened so that the Division can be more effective in providing staff development, technical assistance, resources, etc. A review should be done of its funding sources to ensure that its tax levy allocation is appropriate and in accordance with the needs of Latino language minority students.

4. The Board should ascertain that all curriculum development and selection of textbook and instructional materials undertaken by the Division of Bilingual Education is in accordance

with the goals and objectives put forward by the Chancellor's Multicultural Action Plan. It should also ensure that pedagogical practices are improved and enhanced through comprehensive staff development and training in accordance with these goals.

5. The Board should assure that the Office of Multicultural Education be adequately funded and appropriately staffed so that it can effectively carry out its mission including the 1985 Policy for Intergroup Relations and the recommendations of the Human Relations Task Force put forward in the 1989 report.

6. The Board should develop an educational plan to meet the needs of students who are at the 40th percentile and above who are still underachieving. It must be accompanied by a system to monitor student achievement.

7. The Board should immediately begin an aggressive lobbying effort in support of the reauthorization of Title VII, including a public relations and media campaign.

8. The Board should immediately design and implement a reporting system on the achievement of Latino-LEP students and should continue to intensify its monitoring efforts to insure that LEP students are appropriately served.

9. The Board should immediately reconstitute the Chancellor's

Bilingual Education Commission that would work with his office to set the highest standards for bilingual education; provide support and advice on enhancing, evaluating and monitoring programs and staff development; make recommendations for research and data collection; provide a level of support to and validation of bilingual staff; and work with the Bilingual Parents Commission.

Proposal IV: Ensuring Latino Students meet the Math Standards

Recently, the Chancellor boosted the mathematics requirements for graduation. This is part of a plan to phase in higher standards throughout the system. The Curriculum and Instruction Committee endorses higher standards, but feels strongly that measures to ensure that Latino students are appropriately and adequately prepared are critical. Otherwise, the school system can only expect that more Latino students will fail academically and leave school.

With respect to Math, we have included an adjunct report, entitled Latino Students: Low Math Achievement, that presents the literature on mathematics achievement among Latino students. The following is a summary:

- Eighth-grade mathematics achievement is one of the strongest predictors of school completion for LEP students (NYC Board of Education, 1991).
- Although they have made some progress in the last 18 years of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Latino students of all ages still

perform at a much lower level than their non-Latino white counterparts (De la Rosa & Maw, 1990).

- Puerto Ricans--who represent at least half of the Latino student population in New York City--are at the bottom of all groups in terms of mathematics achievement (De Camp, 1991).
- Sex differentiation of performance in the Latino group is even larger than that observed among whites and these differences increase with age (Moore & Smith, 1987; Children's Defense Fund, 1991, and U. S. Department of Education, 1991).
- There are significant differences in exposure to course work between Latinos and non-Latino whites (among others, De La Rosa and Maw, 1990; Duany and Pittman, 1990, Matthews, 1984; and Moore and Smith, 1985). For example, among seniors tested in 1990, only 44 percent of Latinos as compared to 59 percent of non-Latino whites had taken Algebra II (Rasinski and West, 1990).
- Latino youngsters seem to have positive attitudes towards mathematics, but they do not feel confident in their abilities. In the 1991 NAEP survey, 12th grade Latino students stood out because a majority of them "were unsure or negative about being good in mathematics" (Rendon, 1983; U.S. Department of Education, 1991).

- Despite the common belief to the contrary, language issues do arise in particular in three types of activity involved in learning mathematics -- in understanding the words of the problem or text, in formulating the mathematical concepts required, and in translating the mathematical concepts into symbolism (Brodie, 1989).

Recommendations

Given the needs of Latino students in mathematics and its importance for school completion, academic achievement, and eventually, their successful participation in the work force, the Curriculum and Instruction Committee recommends the following:

1. All Board of Education initiatives, including the Chancellor's Math Working Group, should consider the importance of math for LEP and non-LEP Latino students in their deliberations and include experts in this area in their membership. Consultants and staff with expertise in this area should be hired.
2. Latino students should be given greater access to math-focused schools such as Stuyvesant, Bronx Science, Manhattan Center, and so forth.
3. The NYC Board of Education needs to ensure better cohort data that assesses advanced math course enrollment patterns of Latinos, and LEP students in particular.
4. Every individual in an instructional position within NYC schools should have the opportunity, as part of their

professional development, to acquire the knowledge base and explore pedagogical options designed to teach mathematics effectively to Latino students. The emphasis of staff development in this area should be on the interrelationship of language, gender, and socio-economic status as they affect mathematical proficiency.

5. Existing local initiatives need to include a Latino "strand" or focus, i.e. the NYC Mathematics Project at Lehman College, Bank Street College's "Urban Mathematics Leadership Project," and Community School District #19, which is 42% Latino

6. Joint teacher-administrator planning teams should be instituted to develop plans for improving math achievement, particularly in majority-Latino schools.

7. There is a need for better articulation between elementary, junior high, and high school math curricula.

8. The testing in mathematics needs to be examined for LEP students (just like OREA is currently doing for general education students).

9. The "Math 24" game needs to include bilingual education students and taught as part of the native language mathematics component.

SPECIAL REPORT

LATINO STUDENTS: LOW MATH ACHIEVEMENT

At a time when the U.S. President and Governors have made it one of the national educational goals for the year 2000 that U.S. students become first in the world in math and science achievement with no gap left between Anglo and non-minority students, Latino students are far behind. Some find it understandable--due to perceived language barriers--that Latinos perform poorly in reading and verbal standardized tests; yet the dismal mathematics achievement of Latino students is not as easily dismissed, since most people perceive mathematics as "a universal language of symbols, a process that almost transcends language concerns[1]." Whether or not this is true, it is important that Latino and other minority students improve their mathematics achievement, since ethnic group differences in mathematics aptitude have been found to precede eventual differences in overall academic achievement and attainment.[2] Furthermore, changes in the New York City and U. S. economy that have benefitted technical service-sector jobs over manufacturing jobs which Latinos traditionally have held make it imperative for our youths to acquire sharp mathematical skills in order for the Latino community to attain economic security in the future.[3]

Latino students in New York City reflect these national problems. According to the recent "1990 Dropout Cohort Report" issued by the Board of Education, 27 percent of Latino students in the City, compared to 19 percent of all ninth-graders in 1986-87, had dropped out by their expected graduation date of June 30, 1990. Furthermore, limited-English proficient (LEP)[4] students had dropout rates that are 20 percent higher than those of English-proficient students.[5] This is a relevant finding for Latino students, since about two-thirds of all LEP students are of Latino origin,[6] and about one-fourth of all Latino students are classified as LEP by the Board of Education.[7]

The Board's addendum cohort report on LEP students also notes that eighth-grade mathematics--but not reading--achievement is one of the strongest predictors of school completion for LEP students, along with ninth-grade attendance and native language proficiency in the case of Latino students.[8] In fact, the Normal Curve Equivalency (N.C.E.) scores on a math achievement test[9] administered to a cohort of students starting ninth grade in 1984-85 show that LEP students who graduated on time scored nearly 20 N.C.E.s higher than those LEP students who had dropped out in the four-year period.[10] Further underscoring the importance of math achievement among LEP students is the Board's finding that, among this cohort of LEP students, those that graduated in their four years were more than three times as likely to have either passed a mathematics Regents Competency Test (R.C.T.) or to have taken a Regents exam in mathematics.[11]

Even though more achievement results and pedagogical theories are being reported in relation to the mathematical aptitude of Latino and LEP students, the topic of mathematics achievement among Latino LEP and non-LEP students has not been a prominent one in either the literature on bilingual education or that of mathematics education. Given the combination of the facts stated above--on the one hand, the importance of mathematics achievement among Latino students in terms of both their school completion and future employability; and on the other, the lack of attention paid by mathematics educators to the learning and teaching problems facing these students--it is important to focus on the current status and factors affecting the mathematics achievement of Latino students in New York City.

Although they have made some progress in the last 18 years of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Latino students of all ages still perform at a much lower level than their Anglo counterparts. Of particular relevance to New York City is the fact that, according to the most recent achievement data available by Latino subgroup, Puerto Ricans--who represent at least half of the Latino student population in New York City[12] --are at the bottom of all groups in terms of mathematics achievement. In the eighth-grade achievement tests taken by the sample of the National Educational Longitudinal Survey (NELS:88), Puerto Rican students, like blacks and Native Americans, were almost twice as likely as Anglos (30 versus 16 percent) to perform at a "below-basic" level.[13] These results support the findings of the 1980 High School and Beyond Survey, which had found that

> Puerto Ricans were the lowest achieving... The achievement scores of the Puerto Ricans fell well below the national average, but on measures that test ability [sic], these students score about the same as everybody else. We have, then, a disturbing mismatch between potential and performance.[14]

This disturbingly low math performance of Puerto Rican and other Latino students certainly holds true in New York State as well. In fact, while 80 percent of Anglo eighth-graders in the state showed mastery of "simple multiplicative reasoning and beginning two-step problem solving" (level 250), only 32 percent of their Latino counterparts taking the same test in February 1990 reached that level.[15] This rate was ten percentage-points below the national proportion of Latino eighth-graders reaching that score (250). Given the combination of Anglo scores in New York State that were above the national Anglo average, and Latino scores well below the national average, it is not surprising to see that, out of 39 participating states, New York ranks among the five worst [16] in terms of the Anglo-Latino differential in the proportion of eighth-graders reaching the minimum-expected level of math achievement.

Another finding from the 1990 NAEP math achievement test is even more telling of the math achievement of Latinos in the state: while only 6 percent of NY Latino eighth-graders were in the top one-third of the schools, about 77 percent were concentrated in the bottom one-third of the schools--compared to 43 and 14 percent respectively of their Anglo counterparts (U.S. Department of Education, 1991a:292, 295).

Types of Variables Explaining the Low Math Achievement of Latinos

Among other school-related variables that have been found to influence the learning and participation of minority students in mathematics are: the school climate; the organization of the curriculum--including course offerings, curriculum placement, and class size; the school's resources; and the personnel's demographic characteristics, instructional methods, attitudes and perceptions, and interactions with students (Matthews, 1984).

While school- and student-related variables affecting the mathematics achievement of Latino students probably hold the greatest hope in terms of educational interventions, it should be kept in mind that parent variables also may be important. Latino youths may find it hard to get parental assistance with mathematics homework, since "the parents of Latino adolescents are younger, less educated, employed at lower-paying jobs, and poorer than the parents of white adolescents" (Duany and Pittman, 1990:5). Two of these factors--parent education and family income--are among the most important variables affecting the mathematics achievement of limited-English proficient students (Baratz-Snowden et al, 1988:97).

Notwithstanding, many Latino students have demographic, cognitive, and affective characteristics that help raise their performance in mathematics, beyond what their parents' background would have predicted. For example, in their analysis of data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth of 1980, Moore and Smith (1987:35) found that "the sex differentiation of performance in the Hispanic group was even larger than that observed among whites". Furthermore, sex differences in math achievement among all groups and among Latinos specifically have been found to increase with age, especially after the eighth grade (Children's Defense Fund 1991a, U.S. Department of Education, 1991a:112). The low mathematics achievement of Latina women, for example, has been explained by the conflict many of them feel between family obligations and pursuit of 'masculine' educational aspirations:

> When women expect to assume major child-rearing responsibilities, they will be less likely than men to choose fields that require major educational and labor force commitments (Rendon and Triana, 1989: 9).

Even more than gender, relevant math coursework seems to be the best-documented variable related to mathematical achievement (De La Rosa and Maw 1990, Duany and Pittman 1990, Matthews 1984, Moore and Smith 1985, Moore and Smith 1987, Rendon and Triana 1989, and Valverde 1984). Recent national data show significant differences in exposure to coursework between Latinos and whites, and these differences are directly related to their achievement differentials. Among seniors tested in 1990, only 44 percent of Latinos and 59 percent of whites had taken Algebra II (Rasinski and West, 1990:33).[17] But these differences are already present by middle school: among eighth-graders tested by NAEP last year, only one in ten Latinos--compared with almost one in five whites--was taking algebra (U.S. Department of Education, 1991a:124). At the same time, Latino eighth-graders are twice as likely as their white counterparts (8 and 4 percent, respectively) to be enrolled in remedial math courses (De La Rosa and Maw, 1990:50). One of the saddest things about this difference in exposure to mathematical material is that "for both aptitudes [arithmetic reasoning and mathematical knowledge], taking high-level math classes is somewhat more important for the performance of Hispanics than for Anglos" (Moore and Smith, 1985:290). Given the socioeconomic disadvantages with which they start, Latinos are thus particularly needy of exposure to high-level coursework.

Interestingly, however, the NAEP mathematics proficiency data from 1990 suggests that the white-Latino difference in eighth-grade performance is somewhat larger among those taking algebra than among those taking regular eighth-grade mathematics.[18] Controlling for coursework taken by the eighth grade reduces the white-Latino difference in achievement by about 25 percent[19], just as socioeconomic status does. Whether or not this is significant, the fact is that there are other factors, in addition to coursework taken and socioeconomic status, which may explain the low mathematical achievement of Latino youngsters.

The research related to affective variables is actually encouraging, since Latino youngsters seem to have positive attitudes towards mathematics and do not seem to get discouraged by their poor performance (Matthews, 1984:90). The ASPIRA Five-Cities Survey raises some doubts about Cuban ninth-graders specifically, since about half claimed that mathematics was their least favorite subject (Fernandez et al, 1989:133). But in general, about half of the survey's Latino ninth-graders said that mathematics was their most favorite subject, ranking it only behind physical education and English. Similarly, last year's NAEP survey revealed that black and Latino eighth-graders may have even more positive attitudes towards mathematics than white students, since 34 and 28 percent respectively, compared to 26 percent of whites, agreed with a series of five positive statements about math (U.S. Department of Education, 1991a:202).

While they may like mathematics, Latino youngsters may well have other affective barriers towards the subject, such as feeling they are not good in it. In fact, "confidence may be one of the most important affective variables related to mathematics achievement" (U.S. Department of Education, 1991a:204). In a survey of south Texas community-college students, Rendon (1983, as cited in Rendon and Triana, 1989:11) found that a majority of Latino students felt that "they were not good in mathematics". Similarly, last year's NAEP survey revealed that, by 12th grade, Latino students stood out because a majority of them "were unsure or negative about being good in mathematics" (U.S. Department of Education, 1991a:206). In addition to not feeling confident about their ability in mathematics, many Latino students do not see the connection between what is done with a pen and paper in the classroom and their everyday present or future life (Matthews, 1984:90, Rendon and Triana, 1989:11).

The Language Factor

Regardless of most people's simplistic view that the "language factor" should have no influence on Latino students' performance in the pure, symbolic world of mathematics, it is clear that language issues arise in all three types of activity involved in learning mathematics: in understanding the words of the problem or text (which is often different from everyday uses of that word in

English); in formulating the mathematical concepts required; and in translating the mathematical concepts into symbolism with which to work (Brodie, 1989:46). For Latino students who come from language-minority families--i.e., where Spanish is spoken as a first language--and who are learning mathematics in English, "it may take considerable proficiency in both their first and second languages if they are to cope with the range of linguistic activities required for learning mathematics" (Cuevas, 1984:137). The point is that, for many Latino students, mathematics involves complicated reasoning structures containing not just new vocabulary in a second language, but also frequent use of prepositions (Castellanos, 1980:16) and passive voice (Corasanti Dale, 1984:14), both of which may be confusing even to Latino students for whom English may be the first language.

The available achievement data by language background seems to point to the negative influence of coming from a language background different from that of U.S. schools (English) on the Latino youngster's achievement in math. Data from the NELS:88 show that two in five Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) eighth-graders, compared to one in six of all others, scored below the basic level in mathematics (U.S. Department of Education, 1991c). This should not be surprising, given that one in six of the LEP eighth-graders--compared with only one in 14 of the others--were taking either no math or a remedial course. It seems that even those fully bilingual Latino students who may not be limited in English but simply speak Spanish at home are at a disadvantage, since eighth-graders who speak Spanish at home are almost twice as likely as those who speak English at home (34 compared with 18 percent) to score below a basic level in mathematics[20] (De La Rosa and Maw, 1990:31). Again, this data is strongly correlated with exposure to coursework: one in ten students from a language-minority background, compared to one in 14 of the others, were taking either no math or a remedial course (U.S. Department of Education, 1990b:1). As Mestre reported (1981) in his small-scale study of bilingual college technical students, bilingual Latino students appear to be "at an academic disadvantage not only in performing tasks that require a high degree of semantic processing, but also in completing mathematical tasks of a non-semantic nature as well" (p.1263).

Whether this academic disadvantage is mostly a result of being fluent in Spanish is not settled by the available research;[21] much less is the full effect of learning mathematics in two languages (Lovett, 1980:17). Some studies (Fillmore and Valadez, 1986 as cited in Cardelle-Elawar, 1990:166) have concluded that Latino students at the elementary school level who are taught mathematics exclusively in English do not do as well as those who are taught bilingually. The few studies that address this topic all contain a suggestion to either teach mathematics bilingually or to first develop problem-solving skills in the native language before English (Brodie, 1989; Dale, 1984; Lass, 1988; Secada and Carey, 1990; Valverde, 1984).

In addition to school and parental factors, at least four types of student variables--demographic, cognitive, affective, and cultural/linguistic--help to explain the low achievement of Latino students in mathematics. One of the key interventions that helps Latino students is a teacher who has not watered down the content of the mathematics courses (Duany and Pittman, 1990), who provides constant feedback to his\her students (Cardelle-Elawar, 1990), who reviews and monitors carefully the flow of her lessons (Secada and Carey, 1990:30), who teaches problem-solving skills directly (Lass, 1988), and who "involves the children in carefully structured activities, investigations, and discussions which will ensure understanding" (Cuevas, 1984:139).

In general, students' bilingualism should be recognized and celebrated. Specific ideas include recognizing that math is not an universal language for bilinguals; developing the bilingual students' first-language competence; teaching mathematics to bilingual children bilingually; using culturally-relevant situations and materials; developing a planned, parent-participation model that addresses the needs of Latino parents; and considering pairing Spanish- with English-dominant students for English mathematics instruction as one grouping method (Lass, 1988:481). If these ideas seem too ambitious for teachers to implement by themselves, mention of Jaime Escalante's courageous and successful teaching of calculus might provide them incentives. Minimally, they can make Latino students aware "of possible stumbling blocks common to bilinguals in general, as well as his or her individual academic deficiencies, [so that] then the student can become a better learner by actively trying to compensate for these deficiencies and problems" (Robinson et al, 1980:42). Latino children deserve these academic supports. The future of our community depends on the development of their linguistic and mathematics achievement.

REFERENCES

Baratz-Snowden, Joan, D. Rock, J. Pollack, and G. Wilder, 1988. Parent Preference Study. Prepared by the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation.

Brodie, Karin, 1989. "Learning Mathematics in a Second Language," Education Review, 41 (1), pp. 39-53.

California Department of Education, 1990. Bilingual Education Handbook: Designing Instruction for LEP Students. Sacramento, CA: Bilingual Education Office, Categorical Support Program Division.

Cardelle-Elawar, Maria, 1990. "Effects of Feedback Tailored to Bilingual Students' Mathematics Needs on Verbal Problem-Solving," The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 91, No. 2, pp. 165-175.

Castellanos, Gloria, 1980. "Mathematics and the Spanish-Speaking Student," Arithmetic Teacher, Vol. 28, No. 3, p. 16.

Children's Defense Fund, 1991a. The Adolescent and Young Adult Fact Book. Washington, D.C..

Children's Defense Fund, 1991b. Meeting the National Educational Goals. Washington, D.C.: Child and Family Futures Clearinghouse.

Cuevas, Gilberto, 1984. "Mathematics Learning in English as a Second Language," Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 134-144.

Dale, Terry Corasanti, 1984. "Improving Mathematics Skills," in Educating the Minority Language Student. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

De La Rosa, Denise, and C. Maw, 1990. Hispanic Education: A Statistical Portrait, 1990. Washington, D.C.: National Council of La Raza.

DeCamp, Suzanne, 1991. The Linguistic Minorities of New York City. New York: Community Service Society.

Duany, Luis and Karen Pittman, 1990. Latino Youths at a Crossroads. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Clearinghouse, January/March 1990.

Fernandez, Ricardo, K. Henn-Reinke, J. Petrovich, 1989. Five Cities High School Dropout Study: Characteristics of Hispanic High School Students. Washington, D.C.: ASPIRA Association.

Fillmore, L.W., and Valadez, C., 1986. "Teaching bilingual learners," in M.Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3d. ed., pp. 648-685). New York: Macmillan.

Hernandez, Norma, 1984. "A Model for Mathematics Teaching Effectiveness for Mexican-American Students." Presented at the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education Conference.

Lass, Mary Jo, 1988. "Suggestions from Research for Improving Mathematics Instruction for Bilinguals," Social Science and Mathematics, Volume 88 (6), October 1988, pp.480-7.

Lovett, C. James, 1980. "Bilingual Education: What Role for Mathematics Teaching?," Arithmetic Teacher, Vol. 27, No. 8, pp. 14-17.

Matthews, Westina, 1984. "Influences on the Learning and Participation of Minorities in Mathematics," Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 84-95.

Mestre, Jose et al, 1987. "Comprehending Premises: Effects of Negations and Training among Anglos and Hispanics," National Institute of Education.

Mestre, Jose, 1981. "Predicting Academic Achievement among Bilingual Hispanic College Technical Students," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 41, pp. 1255-1264.

Mestre, Jose, 1986. "A Study of the Algebra Acquisition of Hispanic and Anglo Ninth Graders: Research Findings Relevant to Teacher Training and Classroom Practice," NABE Journal, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 137-1167.

Moore, Elsie G.J., A.W. Smith, 1985. "Mathematics Aptitude: Effects of Coursework, Household Language, and Ethnic Differences," Urban Education, Vol. 20, No. 3, October 1985, pp. 273-294.

Moore, Elsie G.J., A.W. Smith, 1987. "Sex and Ethnic Group Differences in Mathematics Achievement: Results from the National Longitudinal Survey," *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 25-36.

National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, 1984. *Make Something Happen: Hispanics and Urban High School Reform*. Volumes I and II. Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Policy Development Project.

New York City Board of Education, 1991a. "The Cohort Report: Four-Year Results for the Class of 1990 and Follow-Ups of the Classes of 1987, 1988, and 1989," Executive Summary, Spring 1991.

New York City Board of Education, 1991b. "School Completion of Students Limited in English Proficiency; Addendum to The Cohort Report, Spring 1990," Spring 1991.

Orfield, Gary, F. Monfort, and M. Aaron, 1989. *Status of School Desegregation, 1968-1986*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.

Ortiz-Franco, Luis, 1980. "First Glances at Language and Culture in Mathematics Education," National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Conference, August 1980.

Ramirez, Olga M., S. Rebollos-Taube, P. M. Taube, 1990. "Factors Influencing Mathematics Attitudes Among Mexican American College Undergraduates", *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 12, No. 3, August 1990, pp. 292-298.

Rasinski, Kenneth, and Jerry West, 1990. *Eighth Graders' Reports of Courses Taken During the 1988 Academic Year by Selected Student Characteristics*. U.S. Department of Education: National Education Longitudinal Survey of 1988, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Rendon, Laura, 1983. *Chicano students in south Texas community colleges: A study of student- and institution-related determinants of educational outcomes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Rendon, Laura, and Estrella Triana, 1989. *Making Mathematics and Science Work for Hispanics*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Rivera Batiz, Francisco, 1991. "The Effects of Literacy on the Earnings of Hispanics in the United States," in *Hispanics in the Labor Force*, edited by Edwin Melendez et al, New York:

Plenum Press, pp. 53-75.

Robinson, Holly, William Gerace, and Jose Mestre, 1980. "Factors Influencing the Performance of Bilingual Hispanic Students in Math and Science Related Areas," Integrated Education, 18 (5-6), pp. 38-42.

Rosenthal, Alvin, K. Baker, and A. Ginsburg, 1983. "The Effect of Language Background on Achievement Level and Learning among Elementary School Students," Sociology of Education, vol. 56, no. 4, October 1983, pp. 157-169.

Secada, Walter, 1991. "Teaching Mathematics and Science to Limited English Proficient Students," NABE News, National Association for Bilingual Education, June 21, 1991, pp. 15-16.

Secada, Walter and Deborah Carey, 1990. Teaching Mathematics with Understanding to Limited-English-Proficient Students. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College.

U.S. Department of Education, 1990. Dropout Rates in the United States: 1989. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

U.S. Department of Education, 1991a. The State of Mathematics Achievement. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

U.S. Department of Education, 1991b. The State of Mathematics Achievement: Executive Summary. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

U.S. Department of Education, 1991c. The Tested Achievement of the National Educational Longitudinal Survey of 1988 Eighth-Grade Class. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Valverde, Leonard, 1984. "Underachievement and Underrepresentation of Hispanics in Mathematics and Mathematics-Related Careers," Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 123-133.

NOTES

1. See Lass (1988:480).

2. See Elsie G.J. Moore and A.W. Smith, "Mathematics Aptitude: Effects of Coursework, Household Language, and Ethnic Differences," Urban Education, Vol. 20, No. 3, October 1985, pp. 273-294.

3. In a sample of young adults surveyed in 1985 for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, Francisco Rivera-Batiz (1991:71) found quantitative skills to be "the critical variable influencing job opportunities and earnings" for Latino males.

4. Since definition of this term vary from one state to another, the U.S. Department of Education defines a "LEP" student generally as one who is "limited in his or her ability to read, write or understand the English language," as reported by a teacher. In the sample of the Department's National Educational Longitudinal Survey of 1988 [NELS:88], about 9 percent of the Latino students were included in this category, although "it should be kept in mind that students who did not have English as their mother tongue and [sic] had insufficient command of English to complete the NELS:88 questionnaire and test were declared ineligible for inclusion into the sample and were excluded from the NELS:88 survey" (Rasinski and West, 1990:48). Thus, the figure of 9 percent is an underestimate by far.

5. See New York City Board of Education (1991b).

6. See New York City Board of Education, Division of Bilingual Education, "Facts and Figures," 1990-91.

7. See Clara Rodriguez, Puerto Ricans: Born in the USA. New York: Unwin Hyman, 1989, p. 121. The 1985 data cited by Rodriguez reflect neither the continuing immigration of limited-English-proficient Dominican and Central and South American students to New York City, nor the 1989 change in the classification of students as LEP's from those that scored below the 21st percentile in the New York City Language Assessment Battery (LAB) test to those scoring below the 40th percentile.

8. In terms of native language proficiency, Latino "LEP students who went on to graduate high school in four years had a higher mean score on the Spanish Language Assessment Battery than those who dropped out." (New York City Board of Education, 1991b:2)

9. The Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test (S.D.M.T.) was administered in 1984 to this cohort.

10. The difference between these two groups in eighth-grade reading achievement, however, was only about 6 N.C.E.'s. In terms of LEP students in the cohort who were behind in school--i.e., were not graduating four years after their ninth grade but were still enrolled in school by June 1988--the mean N.C.E. scores in mathematics were 7 points higher than those who had dropped out and 12 points lower than those who had graduated.

11. Compared to 84 percent of the LEP graduates, only 23 percent of the LEP dropouts either had passed an R.C.T. exam or had taken a Regents exam in math.

12. See De Camp, Suzanne, The Linguistic Minorities of New York City, New York: Community Service Society, 1991.

13. See De La Rosa, Denise and Carlyle Maw, Hispanic Education: A Statistical Portrait: 1990, Washington, D.C.: National Council of La Raza, 1990.

14. See National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Make Something Happen, New York: Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1984: Vol. I, 32.

15. See U.S. Department of Education, The State of Mathematics Achievement, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1991:268.

16. The other four states included North Carolina, Alabama, and two states--Connecticut and Pennsylvania--in which, like in New York, the Latino population is mostly Puerto Rican. See U.S. Department of Education (1991:268).

17. When looking at achievement figures for Latino 12th graders, it always should be kept in mind that they may well represent the select group of Latinos that has stayed in school until that grade, at which point more than one-third of the original Latino cohort has left school.

18. This analysis does not seem to support Moore and Smith's (1985:292) conclusion from studying NLS 1980 data, where they found that "the more coursework and the more alike the coursework experienced by Anglos and Hispanics, the smaller the differences in math aptitudes".

19. The Anglo-Latino difference in average NAEP proficiency for the eighth-graders who were tested last spring was reduced from 24 points for the totals, to 18 points (thus, by 25 percent) among those Anglo and Latino students who were taking regular eighth-

grade mathematics, as opposed to pre-algebra or algebra (U.S. Department of Education, 1991:124).

20. This data do not isolate the influence of Latino ethnicity from that of language. It may well be that Latino eighth-graders who speak English at home do not score much higher than their Spanish-speaking counterparts.

21. In fact, in a survey of community college students in south Texas, Rendon (see Rendon and Triana, 1989:8) found that both Latino and Anglo students reported similar difficulties with math, and that "less than 10 percent of the Hispanics reported problems understanding English explanations given in their mathematics and science courses. This finding suggests that knowledge and use of Spanish may not hinder mathematics performance. Rather, it may be that Hispanic students have not had the opportunity, in school or outside of school, to develop higher-order thinking skills such as critical thinking, logic, or problem solving".

COMMITTEE ON COUNSELING AND SUPPORT SERVICES.

Introduction

The Counseling & Support Services Committee dealt with more than what is found in this interim report. Repeatedly we have seen debates on school reform generating many innovations centered in school governance, multicultural pedagogy, and parental involvement. The focus of the report, however, is counseling and guidance.

Research has shown a positive correlation between student academic success and the guidance and counseling services they receive (Herr, 1982:5).[1] Yet counseling and support services rarely appear in the educational recommendations for school reform. The lack of recognition of the work of guidance counselors may result from its qualitative nature. In New York City there is no measure of student performance as a result of guidance received. There is no quantifiable record of how guidance counselors encourage parents and caregivers of diverse populations to work cooperatively with school staff in solving a child's problem, or whether guidance counselors recommend appropriate programs and services for students from various populations, or how counselors resolve conflicts.

We believe that guidance, counseling and support services are absolutely critical for Latino students. Students and their families need assistance in overcoming many obstacles in order to ensure academic success and adequate career preparation. Poverty, social dislocation, pressures on parents and caregivers, lack of health care and preventive services, the prevalence of substance abuse, and crime and violence are common stressors that the large majority of students in urban schools must overcome.

For Latino students these problems are compounded by low expectations, discrimination, institutionalized racism, and the lack of understanding of their language and culture by the school system. The effects of these obstacles are evident in the statistics for Latino drop-out rate, documented underrepresentation at specialized and selective-admission junior high and high schools, and lack of appropriate preparation for college and careers. In addition, newly arrived immigrant and migrant Latino students have acute needs in the acculturation and political adjustment processes.

Latino students represent approximately 35 percent of the New York City school population, and the percentage continues to increase. "It is expected that by the year 2000, the Latino student population will increase by 35%, while the percentage for the rest of the student population will decrease by comparison" (Bermudez, 1992). If honored, the wealth of these Latino students' diversity will enrich our schools and society. If ignored, Latino students' cultural resources will be lost to devastating personal suffering and failed potential and social cost.

I. Guidance and Counseling

A: The Role of Guidance Counselor

Physical and psychological health and a secure environment are fundamental to learning readiness and scholastic achievement. All young people need access to comprehensive support services for physical and mental health, a nurturing and stimulating family environment, emotional maturation, stress- management and conflict resolution, and finding acceptance and a sense of belonging in a group. Counseling is key to dynamics of positive change for the individual. Without such support, young people will continue to be barred from developing their full potential.

The organization of support services for students, however, has traditionally been fragmented. For example, a state-mandated health screening referral may uncover needs. Although each of the service providers (teachers, social worker, assistant principal, health aide, and so forth) have performed their task and believe they have contributed to the well-being of the student, there may never be a follow-up. In many instances, the central problem is not so much the lack of services, but the lack of coordination between service providers. Unless the system organizes the delivery of services to students, their needs will not be met. For more Latino students to become recipients, cultural and linguistic factors also need to be integrated in the conceptualization of service needs and delivery plans. The problem is larger than meeting the needs of an individual student. Neither powerful student-focused interventions, nor effective school-limited programs (evaluation, counseling, therapy, guidance, prevention, career/college information and orientation, and enrichment activities), can address the severity created by the lack of coordination and unsympathetic approaches.

The family, school, and community must be enlisted in a coordinated effort to combat environmental stressors and support the strength of resilience among students and their families. This effort must develop a comprehensive plan for coordinating and expanding services to meet students' needs. Each aspect of the plan must include staff development to ensure that every service-provider is culturally competent regarding Latino students, families, and cultures.

The business community has recognized that in order to market products effectively within a different culture, their marketing strategists must understand that culture. They must know how to interact within that cultural context to create mutual trust. In addition to illuminating cultural patterns, the staff development must debunk stereotypes by focusing on the particularity of the individual. For example, a child may be a Spanish- speaking Chilean Jew. This Latino child may have very different needs from other Latino children.

We believe that guidance counselors are in a unique position to catalyze the effort to coordinate services, link the school to family and community, and develop cultural competence for all service providers. They ought to assume leadership roles. They cannot make considerable progress in meeting the needs of Latino students, however, unless they acquire cross- cultural and multicultural expertise.

The American Association for Counseling and Development and the American School Counselors Association have both indicated in numerous reports that the ideal ratio of guidance counselors to general education students is 1:250. Studies in the past fifteen years have shown that counselor to student ratios for students who are in situations involving poverty, social stresses, handicaps, substance abuse, family problems and language difficulties, among others, should be considerably higher, e.g. 1:50-75. The reduced caseload would make it possible for guidance counselors to have more time to appropriately address the counseling needs of these students and their families.

B: Guidance Counselor Data for Community School Districts

There are documented pockets of excellence in New York City guidance and counseling programs. Nonetheless, the need for guidance counselors is apparent. The following statistics highlight the extent of present services.

The 32 community school districts and the Chancellor's school, I.S. 227Q, employ 1,268.5 guidance counselors who serve the basic academic, personal, vocational, social and emotional needs of 683,356 students in grades K-9 (See Chart A.).

At the elementary school level, the overall number of guidance counselors is 677.5 for 490,563 students. For the 192,793 students at the middle school level, the total number of guidance counselors is 591.

The overall ratio of guidance counselors to general education students in grades K-9 is 1:816. While at the middle school level the counselor to student ratio is 1:443, at the elementary school level it is 1:1,198. The ratios differ from borough to borough (See Chart A.).

The 12 community districts with the largest percentages of Latino students (1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 24, and 32) were analyzed for this report. The highest percentage of Latino students (84.3) was found in C.S.D. 6 and the lowest (45.4%) was found in C.S.D. 24. The Latino student to counselor ratio in these districts is 1:2,106. The ratio ranges from 1:1,191 (C.S.D. 32) to 1:13,069 (C.S.D.14).

The overall number of bilingual guidance counselors, at the community district level, is 137. The majority of the bilingual counselors (129) are Spanish-speaking, although they only represent 10.17% of the total number of all community district guidance counselors.

The Division of High Schools employs 807.6 regular full time guidance counselors to serve the basic guidance and counseling needs of 269,372 students (Chart C.). The 253,023 high school students in general education are serviced by a total of 676.1 counselors, whereas 131.5 serve the 16,349 students designated as the Special Education high school population. The counselors serve students enrolled in all types of high schools: specialized, academic-comprehensive, vocational technical, alternative and educational option.

Data on the number of guidance counselors in each of the 126 high schools on a borough by borough basis is provided in Chart C. The breakdown on a borough by borough basis of the ratio of guidance counselors to students participating in general and special education is presented in Chart D. These figures include only licensed guidance counselors and do not include other mental health providers such as SAPIS, social workers, family assistants, etc.

The growing demands and increasing responsibilities of guidance counselors with average caseloads of 1:198 at the elementary level; 1:443 at the middle school level and 1:392.4 at the high school level often results in many youngsters receiving little, if any, counseling services.

The overall number of guidance counselors serving general education students in the 23 high schools that have high enrollment of Latino students is 137; the ratio is one counselor for every 345 students (Chart E). The ratios range from a low of 1:188 at Park East High school to a high of 1:957 at Aviation High School. In these same schools, the total number of Spanish speaking bilingual counselors is 27. The result is a ratio of one guidance counselor to 386 students with ranges from 0.6 to 1:995 at George Washington High School.

The ratio of counselors to students in New York City schools is far from the 1:250 ratio recommended by professional associations. Furthermore, these ratios do not reveal the entire workload of counselors. Responsibilities vary from school to school and district to district. In the focus group conducted by the Counseling & Support Services Committee, counselors reported that in addition to being charged with enhancing students' academic, personal and social and vocational development, they must spend much of their time doing clerical tasks and paperwork.

The results of the disparity in ratios from school to school and district to district are enormous inequities in guidance and counseling services for Latino students. Many Latino students never receive any counseling services. The exceptions are found in mandated and/or special programs.

Given the multiplicity of problems that Latino students face and the shortage of bilingual counseling staff available to serve them, it is no wonder that the academic and personal needs of many students go unnoticed and unattended until it is too late.

C. The Need for Bilingual Counselors

Statistical analysis shows that the ratio of bilingual counselors to Latino students is especially inadequate.

> Many schools house no counselor able to communicate with LEP students and their parents. In other schools, a special education counselor with a full legal caseload, or a general education counselor with a caseload of several hundred might also be bilingual--but if these already burdened counselors cannot squeeze out extra time to meet with limited English proficient students and their families, then language minority students and parents have nowhere else to go. (Educational Priorities Panel, 1988).

The fact that a counselor "speaks my language" has profound meaning in a cultural, political, and psycho-social context. Language and culture are inextricably intertwined, and speaking Spanish to a Latino student or parent coupled with cultural and professional competence is the key to effective intervention.

D. Promoting Parental Involvement through Additional Counselors at the Early Childhood Level

While there are many ways to promote parental involvement, one of the most fruitful avenues is to increase the numbers and expand the role of guidance counselors at the early childhood level.

In addition to facing economic and cultural adjustment stressors, many Latino parents also have to overcome other barriers in order to become involved in their children's schooling: distrust of the system, fear of disclosing personal information (especially for undocumented immigrants), feelings of personal inadequacy in dealing with academic issues, and a sense of the school as a place of discrimination and institutionalized racism.

Yet, at the early childhood level, parents often come to school because they know their children need them. By providing an adequate ratio of guidance counselors and, especially bilingual guidance counselors, the problems encountered by Latino parents can be alleviated. If parents, in their initial contact with the school, find a welcoming place that "speaks their language" and are offered support for their concerns, they will continue to be involved. Increasing the number of counselors, especially bilingual counselors, at the early childhood level where they are most lacking, is a top priority for promoting parental involvement and assuring that students receive appropriate early intervention.

At the middle and high school levels, the intervention of guidance counselors is crucial from a developmental and career perspective. It is during pre- adolescence and adolescence when youth are most likely to be confronted with decisions about personal use of drugs, suicide, sexuality, unplanned pregnancy, and leaving school. These are the years when they are also looking into their future, be it high school or college. Conflicts with parents, peers, authority figures peak during adolescence; it is also when pressure from peers is most strongly felt. Schools need to support these students by creating spaces for self-affirmation as human beings who are members of a variety of groups. They need to learn how to channel their energies, develop leadership skills, and be recognized as contributors. They particularly need to understand how to cope with intergroup dynamics.

E. The Need to Provide Equity in Counseling and Guidance Services for Latino and LEP students in General Education

One of the issues associated with an inequitable allocation of counseling and support services for students in general education is the need to meet special education mandates. Since there is a shortage of counselors, especially those with bilingual/cross-cultural competencies, the priority is to assign them to special education. We are not opposed to this, but would like to voice the need of counselors for Latino students given that they experience the highest dropout rate in the system.

Another layer in the problem of services provision, is that, in these times of scarce resources, cuts in counseling and support services have been traditionally favored over reducing teaching staff. While we are not advocating cutting teaching staff, we do feel that across the board decisions that do not systematically take into account research data on the need for support services are inappropriate and exacerbate the plight of Latino and other students in need.

F. The Need to Offset Adverse Effects of Budget Cuts

Statistics demonstrate the adverse effects of the budget cuts. Hiring additional guidance counselors is necessary just to maintain the level of student support services that were available to students two years ago.

II. Counselor Enhancement

If the vision of counselors as student advocates is to be fulfilled, we must redefine how counselors function. The caseload statistics are the quantifiable symbols of demoralizing conditions. Counselors continue to do their best in a job that can never be done to their own full satisfaction. The greatest source of frustration comes from the recognition that as their roles and functions are now structured in the schools, counselors are used improperly. They are professionally trained to address critical needs, and the system in which they function mitigates against doing so by piling mountains of clerical work on top of the incredibly high caseload. Not only are they relegated to providing band-aid solutions instead of being advocates for students, but they become protectors of the system.

Counselors need exposure to and support in developing innovative methods of addressing their clients' needs. They need opportunities for exercising leadership roles in staff development within the school, in school- parent interaction, and in school- community interaction.

In order to effectively address the problems of Latino students and their families, counselors need paraprofessionals to assist with paper work. And they need an appropriate ratio of counselors, especially those who are bilingual, to students.

Although there are many dedicated counselors who devote hours of personal, uncompensated time to helping their clients, it is unjust for the system to rely on such dedication instead of providing appropriate funds and structure to support such efforts. Counselors have developed a vision of themselves as student advocates and the following suggestions reflect current views from the field as well as recommendations made previously in such reports as Voices from the Field, Nowhere to Turn, and Recommendations of the Chancellor's Working Group on Latino Educational Opportunity (The Carrion Report).

All counselors should be empowered to perform the following functions:

- model how to value other cultures and respect differences;
- develop leadership qualities of Latino and LEP students;
- advocate for Latino and LEP students and their families;
- mediate and facilitate communication between and among students, schools, parents, caregivers, home, community, and community based organizations;
- act as community liaisons;
- coordinate training in multicultural counseling and guidance techniques; and
- perform consultative roles to school staff regarding assessment, placement, articulation, and admissions.

The following is a list of selected expanded services that counselors should be enabled to perform. Some of the recommendations require rule or regulation changes, others require organizational changes, and others require that counselors have time to implement these services. Many of these are based on the supposition that counselors will receive appropriate education and staff development.

1. Extended Family Counseling Time.

> Most school-based guidance and support services are only available when school is in session: from 8:30 to 3:00, 180 days a year. But students need personal and academic counseling at other times of the day, and students and their parents need

> access to services through the day, into the evening, and when school is out of session." (Nowhere to Turn: The Crisis in Middle School Guidance and Support, Educational Priorities Panel, 1988.)

We need to establish comprehensive after- school guidance programs that are staffed by bilingual counselors who are skilled in providing culturally appropriate counseling services to students and parents.

2. Time To Provide both Personal and Academic Counseling.

> A lack of definition between personal and academic counseling means that many students receive academic guidance about high school articulation or middle school course selection, but receive no personal guidance to ensure that high school applications or course selections are linked to the student's goals and interest. In some instances, students' emotional needs are so demeaning that they are offered personal counseling, but personal counseling is usually bought at the expense of academic support and guidance. (Nowhere to Turn: The Crisis in Middle School Guidance and Support, Educational Priorities Panel, 1988.)

3. Network with Schools in Puerto Rico, the Caribbean, Latin American countries.

By establishing contacts with schools in Puerto Rico and other countries from which Latino students come, helpful information on the types of programs and methods of education in their previous schools can be given to the students' teachers to help them in planning or modifying instruction for those students.

An interchange of information regarding methods, materials, and programs will be highly beneficial to New York City schools as well as the sending schools. Such information can lead to closer articulation and a more concerted attempt to address the high rate of mobility among Latino youngsters.

Other recommendations drawn from Voices from the Field, Priscilla Chavez-Reilly, 1991 include the following:

4. Develop Student Support Groups and Networks for Latino and LEP Students.

Guidance counselors have skills in the process of building and facilitating support groups. With the additional focus of coping with common problems related to language and culture, such groups can help to empower students to cope with their own problems and to work for changes that will support their development.

5. Improve Linkages between and among Students in Special Programs and General Education.

Guidance counselors provide services for students in regular education, special education and bilingual education. As a consequence, they are in an ideal position to coordinate the smooth transition of students between these services. Guidance counselors, especially bilingual guidance counselors, can enhance LEP student access to enrichment activities in music, art, clubs, leadership, and other extracurricular programs, as well as identifying those who are ready for mainstreaming.

The committee supports the following additional reforms:

6. Enhancing the Role and Function of the Pupil Personnel Team.

The pupil ersonnel team is fundamental to implementing the new vision of comprehensive services based on each student's physical, emotional, and academic needs. The ultimate goals are to use the team members' expertise to enhance the school climate, and facilitate early identification, intervention and prevention of problems in a comprehensive and coordinated manner. Ideally, each student should have a profile upon entrance and a continuing record of how his or her needs are being met.

7. Education and staff development

There are currently a large percentage of new supervisors of guidance. Because we are formulating a new vision for the way counselors function, these supervisors must be included in the staff development. They in turn will be able to energize and articulate the new vision to counselors in their districts.

Staff development should include developing a framework for understanding different aspects of culture, language and ethnicity within a socio-economic and political context.

All counselors, both new and experienced, should participate in staff development that increases their understanding of our student population, the cultural influences on developmental expectations, and the cultural socio-economic and political conditions of Latino students in our school system.

All counselors should participate in mandated in-service courses and workshops to provide them with current information, resources and strategies in career education and multicultural counseling.

Counselors should be offered the opportunity to attend a guidance and career education summer institute.

Staff development must be conducted for all counselors involved in the high school application and articulation process. The training must be preceded by revising publications such as the High School Guidance Planning Handbook and all other documents that relate to that process. The revision is necessary to add multicultural components and make the instruction more user friendly. Staff development can then have real impact on achieving equal access for Latino students.

A similar component in training for equal access is to include in depth exploration of the problems and solutions to providing access to mathematics classes and specific support services for Latino students.

Pupil Personnel Teams must be offered appropriate staff development in implementing the new vision.

8. Enforcement of State Education Mandates for School Guidance Plans

At present there is no effective monitoring and enforcement of the implementation of school guidance plans. Without monitoring and mandating for guidance plans the new vision cannot be implemented and support services will be unable to maintain the ground gained through the initiation of the guidance plans.

III. Linkages

A. Linkages with Community Based Organizations

Since it is unrealistic to expect that all necessary services needed by children and families will be provided in the school, a sound strategy calls for full involvement of community-based organizations in the identification of problems, development of initiatives to address problems and the coordination and management of programs.

The school is only one key element of a network of agencies and institutions that must be energized and empowered to work together, create a true sense of community, and foster a collaborative atmosphere among all service providers.

One of the important aspects of this plan must be establishing procedures for referral and follow-up with community-based organizations. The following quotation from Nowhere to Turn reflects the current situation:

> Although other publicly funded agencies near city schools often provide services to adolescents in the area of family violence, sexual abuse, health and personal and developmental counseling, systems for referral or coordination between schools and community-based organizations are virtually nonexistent. (Nowhere to Turn: The Crisis in Middle School Guidance and Support, Educational Priorities Panel, 1988.)

Counselors should work collaboratively with instructional staff and mental health service providers to ensure that cultural issues are jointly addressed.

Another part of the strategy for linkages with community based organizations must be the review and revision of contract language to insure that the service providers have the personnel and resources to assure that services are culturally appropriate.

The linkage strategy must also include the following organizational changes:

- Establishment of community-based consortia with direct advisory capacity to district and High School superintendents;

- Revision of structure for the panel, or personnel review contracts with community based organizations to ensure that a Latino is included in the process.

The goals to be conveyed to community-based organizations that are prospective service providers for Latino students are to include the following:

- To provide career development and mentoring at professional and technical levels;

- To provide students, school personnel, and families with enhanced understanding of the impact of the migration experience and enhanced skills to cope with these effects;

- To foster intergroup relations;

- To develop leadership skills.

B. Linkages with Universities

Counselor preparation needs to be revised at the university level to conform with the realities of school problems, provide cultural competence, and provide training in new areas such as family counseling, referrals and linkages with community-based organizations.

C. Linkages with Media

Knowing where to access the appropriate information and how to get the information to the target population is crucial. We must devise methods of using a wide base of newspapers, television, radio, community-based organizations that serve particular populations to enlist and coordinate their services to inform Latino students and their families about educational opportunities, services, programs, grants and scholarships.

IV. Migration Orientation Program

While all of the foregoing recommendations are directed to meeting the needs of Latino and LEP students, there is at present no full-scale effort dedicated to addressing the problems encountered in the experience of migration.

Despite the acknowledged diversity of Latino students with regard to socio-economic status, nationality, personality, and individual attributes, Latinos in New York City often share common migratory experiences. Many students experience in varying degrees: family schisms, personal disorganization, longing for home, intergenerational conflicts, difficulties with intergroup relations, and discrimination and institutional racism. They need meaningful support in their struggle to overcome these obstacles, resolve conflicts, and find ways to affirm their cultural traditions and maintain a sense of continuity while adjusting to a new setting.

Recognizing that all of the above impact students' readiness to learn, the Committee proposes the development of a Migration Orientation Program to enhance cohesion among students, parents, teachers, counselors, and other school staff.

Schools have established prevention programs which address substance abuse, school dropout, AIDS, and other initiatives that deal with emotional life and conflict resolution. New arrivals deserve the same quality of response to their specific needs.

Among the issues addressed in a migration orientation program are the erosion of bonds between first generation migrants who bring the values, mores and ethics of their countries of origin and their children who must balance these with the acceptable standards of the newly adopted American culture. Without doubt, all Latinos are challenged by the balancing act of transculturation and acculturation. As adults, however, we are allowed to make "responsible and informed choices" about what is or is not personally acceptable. Children and youth, on the other hand, are usually expected to conform to the standard set by the parent or the school authority. Any deviation is unfavorably seen as rebellion. We must open channels of communication within immigrant families and in school settings to mediate the cultural clashes that affect academic achievement. We must facilitate cultural integration and the mending of relationships.

Migration Resource Center

In order to implement the Migration Orientation Program, the Committee proposes the creation of a Migration Orientation Resource

Center that would be given the following responsibilities:

- to examine the state of immigrant and migrant families;
- to alleviate conditions that hamper Latino students' academic achievement;
- to develop remedies for the resolution of common problems;
- to create strategies to support student and parent empowerment.

Among the specific tasks of the Resource Center would be setting an agenda, developing a curriculum, and establishing and directing training programs for parents, counselors, and teachers.

While the primary focus must be Latino students, members of the Committee were in favor of extending this model to all immigrant and migrant populations. A future recommendation should address whether or not several such centers could be combined at the same site. All Committee members agreed with the concept of sharing common experiences of new arrivals across cultures as an effective way to build a feeling of shared community to help reduce intergroup conflicts.

Summary

Counseling and support services are key in correcting the equity issues that impact adversely on Latino students. Overrepresentation in overcrowded and/or segregated schools, failure to take mathematics courses commensurate with their mathematical abilities, lack of equal access to information and materials because these have not been translated, lack of equal access to appropriate career and college/orientation and information, a general failure to convey high expectations for achievement and leadership development, and institutionalized discrimination and racism are areas in which guidance and counseling services must be mobilized to effect change.

We have a new vision for the counselor as student advocate linking all services to meet the needs of Latino students and their families. The Committee has made many detailed recommendations to actualize that vision. The following are the highlights and priority areas:

- Increasing the number of counselors, especially bilingual counselors, to the numbers of students they serve;

- Increasing the numbers of bilingual counselors for early childhood to provide early intervention and to increase parent involvement;

- Resolving equitably the mandated needs for counseling in special education and the needs for bilingual counselors and counseling services for Latino students in general education;

- Improving Linkages with community-based organizations including a revision of the contracting process;

- Enhancing the role of the counselor so that all counselors can become student advocates, share their expertise in multicultural perspectives, and participate in ongoing staff development;

- Monitoring of the implementation of school guidance plans;

- Creating a Migration Orientation Program and a Migration Resource Center to meet the needs of newly arrived Latino students.

The Committee proposes that the school system develop a vision that acknowledges the obstacles Latino students and families face in their quest for justice and equity. This vision builds on the diversity, richness, and strengths that Latino students bring to the school and it fosters their dreams of leading fulfilling lives. We want this new vision to acknowledge that Latino students and their families are from many diverse cultures drawn together by a common language. The bicultural, tri-cultural, and multicultural heritage--of Caribbean, Central and South American indigenous peoples, of African, of European, and of Asian peoples--are part of the Latino communities' richness. They come from scores of different countries around the globe and their needs are not one, but multiple.

The system needs to organize counseling and supportive services so as to embody the principles of multiculturalism. They must also be organized so that counselors are considered advocates for students. The number of counselors with bilingual/multicultural competence must increase. The ratios of students to counselors need lowering.

Counselors' paperwork loads need to be decreased through better staffing. A comprehensive plan for service delivery needs to be developed and the role of the counselor needs to be reconceptualized. Counseling and support staff ought to be advocates of students and assume roles of leadership in parental involvement, in linkages with homes and schools as well as other support service agencies, and in staff development for teachers, administrators, and other service providers. Creating such a model will not only ensure equity, it will ensure excellence for all our students.

COMMITTEE ON PARENT AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT.

Almost two decades of research have documented the positive effects of parent involvement on the academic achievement of children. Five types of parental involvement which lead to improved performance by students have been identified. These are: 1) providing supportive home environment; 2) increasing parent/teacher communications; 3) parent volunteerism; 4) parent participation in the learning process; and 5) parent involvement in advocacy/governance structures.[1]

The literature provides valuable clues on parental involvement in the educational process. It is, however, based on "a schema for parent participation derived from the behaviors of middle-class parents". [2] It also fails to account for the linguistic and cultural differences which characterize Latino families and which influence home-school interaction. These differences are various, depending on the subgroup. Latinos are neither culturally nor linguistically homogenous, nor do they share one historical perspective. Their histories of political participation, social development, and economic attainment differ. Finally, the literature fails to take into account the institutional obstacles and systemic discrimination faced by Latino parents.

Many criticize Latino parents for not being more involved in schools without understanding that numerous pressures thwart them. These include economic concerns, linguistic and cultural intimidation, racism on the part of school personnel, professional elitism and a lack of flexibility in work schedules.

But it is not enough to recognize these pressures which shape

Latino parent involvement strategies. It is not enough to legislate involvement. It is not enough to cite the research literature to validate the need for parents to participate in the life of schools. Nor does it suffice to conclude that parents, students, community residents and community-based organizations must all join to make schools work for our children.

In setting an agenda for the work of the last eight months, the Committee on Parent and Community Empowerment decided to focus on parental involvement from two perspectives: 1) participation in school governance, and 2) involvement in improving the quality of education. One cannot shape children's education without being involved in shaping the structures that set policy and provide instruction.

The Committee also decided to take a closer look at the mechanisms available at the New York City Board of Education that are supposed to facilitate the participation of parents, community residents, students, and community-based organizations.

Finally, in the Committee's judgement, community empowerment cannot be achieved in its totality without considering the contracting and procurement practices of the Board of Education as they relate to Latino contractors. Community empowerment can take place if parents and residents are participating in the life of schools, if community organizations work in concert with schools to augment and enhance services to students, and if the Latino business community participates fully in the wealth of the institution.

I. Political Participation of Latino Parents in Community School Boards

The 1960's witnessed a tremendous upheaval in major urban centers of the country. In New York City, African American and Puerto Rican parents, responding to the continued failure of the school system to provide quality education to their children, fought for community control of the schools.

Parents were concerned about how and what their children were being taught and about who was teaching them. They were concerned about an irrelevant and racist curriculum, about a hostile bureaucracy, and about the amount of power being exercised by the teachers' unions. Parents saw their involvement as a way to hold the system accountable.[3]

Taking a closer look, we saw two phenomena operating. One was involvement to improve the quality of education, the other involvement in the political process through which the system is governed. It became evident that parents and community had to become involved as a whole in the decision-making process that was shaping their children's education.

Strong and consistent involvement in the decision-making process can set the conditions which facilitate parent involvement on all other levels, and makes it an interactive, democratizing, and empowering process. It also empowers the children by changing the power relationships that exist between the school system and our communities. It has been affirmed that when parents are enabled, their children have a better chance at success.

Unfortunately, the decentralized system that was put in place as a result of the high level of community activism during the 1960's has not resulted in significant participation. Throughout the last twenty years school activism has subsided, though particular issues still generate angry mobilizations. In fact, several Latino districts stand out in terms of their ability to organize parents around school based issues as well as for community school board elections.

Today there is an opportunity for the Latino community to contribute substantially to the debates around the issues of decentralization and governance. But, in order to effectively do so, Latino parents and Latino community organizations need to be informed of the issues and need to be included as equal partners in the major school restructuring efforts taking place.

In April 1991, the Temporary State Commission on New York City School Governance (Marchi Commission) put forward a series of recommendations that could empower parents and invest schools and community school districts with substantial responsibility and accountability for improving education. The proposals call for the elimination of proportional representation and for redistricting with smaller, more representative voting wards within each district. The community school board election process would continue to be an arena for citizen and non-citizen Latino parent participation, making it imperative for the Board to register parents to vote and develop the appropriate mechanisms to ensure maximum participation and a legitimate voice in English as well as in Spanish.

To attain the maximum participation of Latino parents and community in the community school board elections process, we make the following recommendations:

- The Board should immediately begin to conduct information sessions regarding the Marchi Commission findings and recommendations. These sessions should encourage a true public dialogue and debate, and lead to the development of an action plan that incorporates community input. The Board must ensure participation of Latino parents.

- The Board should establish an adequately-funded special community school board elections unit that would have a two-fold purpose: to educate parents about the elections and train potential candidates, and to monitor the conduct of the Board of Elections. It must be properly staffed with Spanish-speaking personnel, who are trained to work with citizen and non-citizen parents. The independent special unit would work with the Office of Parent Involvement and the Office of Community School District Affairs.

- The Board should work with the mainstream media and the Spanish-language media so as to regularly disseminate information about the elections and all related activities and events.

- The Board should support legislation that would maximize parent involvement in the elections process and facilitate the candidacy of parents for community school boards through parent set-asides, and the provision of adequate stipends for board members.

- The Board should prepare and implement the proper procedures to ensure maximum parent voter registration. This includes compliance with the 1989 Chancellor Mecklowitz memo regarding regular voter registration, distribution of bilingual information that clearly explains the rights of non-citizen parents in school board elections, and training of all Board of Education personnel regarding the elections and the rights of citizen and non-citizen parents.

- The Board and community school districts should work closely with Latino community-based organizations to coordinate and maximize voter education and training efforts.

- The Board should mandate on-going training for superintendents, principals, teachers, and other school/district personnel on effective ways to work with Latino parents. Board of Education training on parent/school relations should be a requirement for all staff entering the school system which would entail articulation with higher education institutions so that they include this training among the requirements for certification.

- The Board should mandate that each community school district and school report on how it has ensured maximum Latino parent participation: i.e. registration procedures, training and information, availability of school buildings for forums and meetings, parents associations, etc.

II. Mechanisms for Parent Involvement

Parents can exercise their political strength vis-a-vis the educational policy process through parents' associations, school- based management teams, governing councils, as school board members and as active participants in the school board elections process. These formal participatory vehicles have not, however, been effective for Latino parents because of institutional obstacles and the lack of information and training provided to Latino parents.

In order to study the mechanisms available to encourage and enhance parental participation in schools, the Committee met with representatives of the Office of Community District Affairs (OCDA) and the Board's Office of Parental Involvement (OPI). It also looked at the proposed Bill of Rights for Students.

A closer look at OCDA, the office established by the Board to ensure that each of the 1,000 schools in the system has an elected parents' association (PA), yields mixed results. The office attempts to assess the degree to which the PA is actually functioning and reporting its financial dealings to the body of parents. At the same time, it functions as a clearinghouse for complaints from parents who feel that their PA is not functioning properly.

Given the large number of parents' associations in the system and the small number of workers (12) in OCDA, it is virtually impossible to evaluate the functioning of PA's. At the school level, principals are only required to certify parent association elections with no mandate to evaluate their effectiveness. Thus, PA's can and do exist on "paper only" with no viable role in fostering parental involvement in school life.

The Board's Policy on Parents Associations and the Schools (the Blue Book) is an important document regarding school governance. Latino parents should be trained on the provisions in the Blue Book and the importance of participating in PA's. The Parents Bill of Rights must also be made available to them.

The issue of budgets is a mystified area that parents, school board members and community residents have been discouraged to deal with due to the complicated manner in which budgets are presented. The new school budget report prepared by the Office of Budget Operations and Review is a step in the right direction. The format, however, needs to be simplified and made more accessible.

A second mechanism, the Office of Parental Involvement (OPI), was created in 1987 to provide information and training to parent associations. A small staff of 15, ten of whom work in special education, are responsible for all PA's in the system. OPI funds, monitors and evaluates 92 Parental Involvement Projects. The grants OPI awards average $20,000. The Office also facilitates and provides assistance to the Chancellor's Parents Advisory Council.

It was noted by the Committee that since no regulation requires or mandates PA training, school districts can refuse staff involvement from OPI. Succinctly put, though parents' associations have proven to be pivotal in nurturing students' academic success, and important in creating a healthier school environment, no mechanisms presently exist to measure their effectiveness.

A similar situation exists when one looks at student participation. In November 1991, public comments for the working draft of the "Bill of Student Rights and Responsibilities K-12" were requested by the Board of Education. In early March, 1992, a revised version of this document was disseminated for additional comments. Although the document contains ample information about how the students can participate in the life of a school through student-run organizations, preparation and dissemination of information, and inclusion on school committees when appropriate, it is not clear what mechanisms will guarantee their participation. As with parent associations, much is written about student rights and student involvement, but little about who should monitor their participation and how it could be encouraged at the school level.

Given the importance of parent and community empowerment, we make the following recommendations:

- The Board of Education require from the Chancellor an independent yearly evaluation of the state of Latino parent involvement in governance including such areas, but not limited to: parents' associations, Chapter 1, school based management teams, Circular 30R Committees, Title VII Bilingual Parent Advisory Councils, community school boards. This report should include a data analysis, quality of participation and parent surveys. A monitoring system should be developed to ensure compliance.
- The Chancellor require that the Office of Parent Involvement notify each district that it is available to meet with Latino parents from the Parents Councils in each district to provide leadership training, technical assistance, and resources.

- The Board make available to parents a variety of options where they can obtain on-going leadership training. This training can be contracted out to parent and community based organizations through an RFP process.

- The Board reestablish the position of Bilingual Community Liaison in every school and district where Latino students account for more than 25 percent of school enrollment. The responsibilities of the Liaison should be determined in each district through a collaborative process involving parents and schools.

- The Board adopt "friendly formats" for presentations of budget allocations. The model used in District 15 should be utilized by the Board.

- The Board direct every school with a student body that is 25 percent or more Latino to provide Spanish translations for every Parent Association meeting and school-to-parent communication. Evidence of this must be provided in the yearly evaluation report.

- That School Superintendents make Latino parent activity and involvement a key criterion in the evaluation of school principals where the Latino student population is more than 25 percent.

- The Board charge the Office of Monitoring and School Improvement (OMSI) with enforcing the functioning of Parent Associations by having schools provide to OMSI a copy of their up-to-date bylaws, current list of elected officers and mailing addresses, minutes, and evidence of translations.

- The Chancellor provide additional staff to the Office of Community District Affairs (OCDA) to provide technical assistance to the PA's beyond the minimum criteria which now exists.

- The Chancellor provide additional staff and adequate funding to the Office of Parent Involvement to ensure that it effectively carries out its responsibilities to parents. Presently the Office is seriously understaffed and underfunded.

- The Chancellor charge the OCDA with enforcing the provisions of the revised Parents' Blue Book, "Parents Associations and the Schools." Guidelines should be developed as to the penalties that the PA itself will face if the parent body does not have access to it or if the PA does not make itself accountable to the parent body.

- The Board allocate funds to PA's to function effectively.

- Direct the Chancellor to improve monitoring of Latino student empowerment. Indicators of such empowerment might include participation on SBM teams and in student government.
- Involve Latino students in decision-making regarding their education including areas such as curriculum, instruction, support services, development and enforcement of the discipline code, student government, school security and violence prevention and extra curricular activities.
- Expand community service opportunities for students along with opportunities to act as paid peer mediators and conflict resolvers.

III. Adult Education

Providing direct service to Latino parents can increase their participation in the life of schools because they will be better able to develop the skills necessary to negotiate more effectively the educational system for their children. At the same time, they will also be able to develop the skills necessary to help their children succeed in school.

The Board of Education attempts to provide services to adults through its Office of Adult and Continuing Education. The Office serves youths and adults 17 and older with a budget of approximately $32 million. Many of its programs are located in churches, community-based organizations, unions, and libraries.

Funding comes from a variety of sources, mostly legislative initiatives. Presently 55,000 to 60,000 adults are served every year in basic literacy, English as a Second Language (ESL), GED preparation, and pre-vocational and occupational training programs.

Two-thirds of all participants are enrolled in basic skills programs, with more than half in ESL courses. In spite of the impressive numbers, presently seven to ten thousand adults are on waiting lists for ESL. These waiting lists only partially demonstrate the true need, since many programs no longer accept names for their waiting lists.

The Committee recommends that:

- The Board provide public reporting on adult education data by ethnicity, program and borough on an annual basis.
- The adult education curriculum should integrate literacy with an inter-related agenda of the needs of the communities in which these participants reside, many of whom are parents in the local school districts. These classes should be seen as a tool for learning and a vehicle to make a real difference in parents' ability to effect schools and the community at large.
- The Board must assist all GED students with job information and placement and develop a mechanism to ensure that they are not discriminated against because of their GED status.

IV. Contracting Practices

To ascertain involvement of Latino contractors in the procurement process at the Board of Education, the committee met with a representative of the Bureau of Supplies. Presently, purchasing agents of the Bureau are responsible for maintaining a list of eligible vendors. If a school wants a particular product, the purchasing agent alerts the vendors and the bidding process begins. By law, the lowest responsible bid must be selected. Advertisement for contracts is done exclusively in the CITY RECORD.

Bureau representatives pointed to recent efforts to attend minority business conferences. They estimated that 10 percent of all current vendors are minorities. To be a minority vendor, the Board of Education requires certification from the State's Office of Economic Development. At this time, there are no purchasing agents assigned to increase the number of minority vendors on the various lists who are eligible to participate in an operation which purchases $500 million in goods.

Questioned about preference to New York City vendors, Bureau representatives indicated that General Municipal Law 103 stipulates that a geographical requirement for bidding based on political boundaries is prohibited. In fact, a vendor can have operations in any country and is eligible to participate in the bidding process. The only instance in which a vendor may be given preference due to geographical location is in the case of a tie bid.

Schools can also purchase goods. As long as a commodity is not under contract and is not deemed to be a regulated item, a school may bid out of all requirements stipulated in the Standard Operating Procedures Manual. For contracts under $250, no competitive bidding is necessary; up to $3000, three telephone quotes confirmed by letters is required; for contracts fluctuating between $3000 and $5000, a price quote letter is required; and for contracts up to $15,000, the tab procedure is needed.

At this time, the Bureau of Supplies does not have a mechanism for identifying either minority vendors on their lists or those holding contracts with the Board of Education. Efforts are underway to address this issue. The committee makes the following recommendations for enhancing Latino contractors' involvement in the Board of Education procurement process:

- Develop a plan with specific targets of utilization of minority and women-owned companies throughout the Board's procurement system. The plan should include present utilization rates, outreach mechanisms, technical assistance and access mechanisms for these companies. The Board should undertake research in this area.

- Allow, foment and reward in the competitive bidding process the pairing of large contractors with Latino and other minority/women- owned businesses.
- Develop and implement a mechanism for identifying Latino and other minority/women/owned vendors of color.
- Run focus groups of Latino and other minority/women-owned contractors to get first hand information about obstacles and possible interventions. Assign purchasing agents to increase the number of Latino and other minority/women-owned vendors on eligibility lists.

V. Participation of Community- based Organizations

The Board of Education utilized a portion of its dropout prevention funds (AIDP) to contract out services which are provided to students by community- based organizations (CBO's). Approximately $12 million are contracted out to CBO's throughout the City. Approximately $2.5 million of these are contracts with Latino CBO's.

An Advisory Board has been set up to oversee the functioning of the CAPS program. Staff at United Way is responsible for program and fiscal monitoring, although schools and districts are involved in selecting participating CBO's. Since United Way became the professional agent for this program, there has been an increase in the number of Latino agencies participating in the program, although some of the agencies have not received adequate funding. This increase has resulted in more bilingual/bicultural programming for schools with predominantly Latino students.

However, CAPS is just a fraction of total funds available from government to serve students or other young people. Other city agencies like the Department of Youth Services, the Community

Development Agency, the Department of Employment, and the Department of Cultural Affairs, to name a few, provide additional dollars to serve New York City's young people. It is common to see an after-school program sponsored by a CBO operating only two blocks away from the community school yet having no relationship with the school. Many Latino CBO's provide educational services to our youth through non-Board of Education funding.

1.Epstein, J. & Dauber, S., "Teacher Attitudes and Practices of Parent Involvement in Inner-City Elementary and Middle Schools," Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, Report 33, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, March 1989.

2. Torres-Guzman, Maria E., "Recasting frames Latino parental involvement", in Faltis, C. & M. Mc Groarty (eds.), In the interest of languages: contexts for learning & using Language. Berlin; Walter de Grupter & Co. 1990.

3.Caballero,D., "Parents Against the Odds," Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos BOLETIN, Volume II, No. 5, New York, Spring, 1989.

COMMITTEE ON FACTORS AFFECTING LATINO STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT.

Of all the topics addressed by the Committees of the Latino Commission, the range of possibilities offered to the Committee on Factors Affecting Latino Students' Achievement appears to have been the broadest. When the Committee members began to work, we found ourselves facing the realization that there were few educational and social factors which did not affect the achievement of Latino students.

The first task of the Committee, therefore, was to set priorities among the list of possible issues. We rejected those which we felt we could not investigate comprehensively within the Commission's limited time frame. Other factors, stemming from the broad effect of poverty and racism in the U.S., called for policies and recommendations which went far beyond the scope of this Commission or the control of the N.Y.C. Board of Education. These remain of fundamental concern to the Factors Committee, the reader is referred to Ogbu and Matute Bianchi, others, 1986, for example.

After some deliberations, the Factors Committee chose five broad sets of issues for review and recommendations. These were School/Community Relations, School/Work Linkages, Self Esteem, Intergroup Relations, and Security. Clearly these areas overlap with one another, as well as with some of the work of other committees of the Latino Commission. Some of the material generated by the Factors Committee, therefore, appears in the work of other Committees, specifically the one on Parent and Community Empowerment. This is as it should be: Our children's lives are a whole; all the forces which affect and support them must work together to nurture the children so that they may reach their full potential.

The five sections which follow present a rationale for the Committee's thinking in each of the five areas we selected, followed by a series of special recommendations which the Committee feels are important, and are within the power of the Board to make reality.

I. School/Community Realationships

Latino families in New York City are largely working class and poor, trapped in impoverished communities at a time when the jobs which they sought have disappeared, and the economy of the region as a whole is in decline. These conditions, combined with a prevailing environment of racial and cultural misunderstanding if not outright prejudice, has led many parents to feelings of helplessness and anger, a lessened sense of personal power, and diminished confidence in school governance. Many Latino families lack critical information about schools and educational options available to their children. They lack critical health care and other social support services to help them deal with the stresses that are born out of the poverty and prejudice in which they live. They also lack the connections to the agencies and institutions which can provide resources and services they need.

The recommendations which follow rest on our contention that the conditions of families must be acknowledged and responded to by the schools which serve New York's children. Moreover, these responses must reach beyond the usual scope of school activities to include linkages with service providers and community organizations to rebuild a network of supports for Latino children and their families.

A: Creating Networks of Caring and Support for Parents

This committee calls for a vision of the community school as the center of a family support system, with linkages to community organizations, churches, and other service providers, both city and private. The community school concept is not a new one; a number of such schools operate in the city. We see the schools as playing an essential focal point in networking parents with city and private services and resources, as well as providing classes, social events, and key information for Latino parents. Services could be provided on an outreach basis in schools, including clinics and child care services. For the school to function as a service center, however, parents and representatives of community organizations need to be involved in identifying needs and resources, as well as planning the community school effort.

A related recommendation is that each Community School District create an office which would function as an outreach center, including a clearinghouse for information about job training programs, health and other social services, and educational programs available to parents and students. This office could also seek linkages with city agencies serving the communities sending children to the schools.

Although this recommendation goes beyond the scope of this Commission, this committee thinks that the political leadership of New York needs to re-think districting in such a way that school, fire, health, and sanitation areas are coterminous, in order to encourage integrated planning and service delivery to economically-stressed communities.

B: Organizing the School as a Community Focal Point

The community school concept involves making the school responsive to the community by offering expanded services to children, their families, and the community during the evenings and on weekends. Activities could include: serving meals; providing study help and tutoring for students; offering E.S.L. and other classes for parents; offering social activities and sports for youth and their families; and providing referrals to and linkages with community service and government agencies.

There are a number of examples of successful community schools which can serve as models. Carter and Chatfield (1986) describe Calvin J. Lauderbach Community School in East Los Angeles, a bilingual school which is open to the community 24 hours a day, and is closely linked with parents and community groups. The school provides resources to and receives assistance from the community in an ongoing fashion. Closer to home, P.S. 30 in C.S.D. 7 and P.S. 38 in C.S.D. 15 are two of the eight New York City public schools participating in the State-funded Community Schools Pilot Project. With funding for extended hours and multiple links with agencies in and beyond the community, these and the other six schools may provide some productive models for how linkages can be forged. The Edwin Gould Foundation For Children had the first technical assistance contract to work with New York

City's Community Schools, and has considerable expertise which the Board could call upon to facilitate the expansion of the community school concept in the City.

C: Opening Communication Channels With Parents

Latino children, like all children, flourish in school when:

- they and their families are considered valued members of the school community;
- schools recognize and build on their strengths; and
- they see schools offering meaningful linkages between students' families/communities and the wider society beyond.

There is a well-known gap between the families of Latino children and most of the schools which serve them. This gap is the product of many factors, including an all-too common ignorance of the students' language or their cultural backgrounds.

- Many Latino parents perceive New York City schools as places in which they are not respected, welcomed, or understood. Some parents feel intimidated by administrators and teachers.
- Some Latino parents bring respectful attitudes towards schools and teachers, which keep them from challenging decisions made by schools for their children.
- Many have little experience with schooling, and are unsure of how to support their children in school, or how to function as advocates for them. Overwhelmingly, they lack information about educational options available for their children, as well as what option might be best.
- Some parents find it difficult to visit their child's school because of conflicting work schedules or responsibility for other children at home.
- Yet others may be hesitant to approach the school because of their immigration status.

If they are to attract and serve Latino children effectively, schools must make aggressive efforts to change the way they reach out to Latino parents.

For some students, asking them to be successful in school is asking them to be different from their parents. They resist, because the family is their only certain source of self-affirmation. It is therefore essential that parents be encouraged to support the school, and tell their children that they support the direction the school wants to help them move in. **This can only be done by respecting and listening to parents** (Comer, 1988; Hawley and Rosenholz, 1984; Epstien, 1987; and Cummins 1986).

Schools which want to reach parents have to work actively to welcome them. This should involve creating opportunities for parents and teachers to interact, whether by visit, telephone, or written communication. It is important for teachers to be able to create a relationship of respect and trust with parents, which in turn implies ensuring that teachers understand parents' cultural backgrounds and concerns. Communication can be encouraged by:

- hiring bilingual staff as appropriate;
- providing training in multicultural understanding for all teachers;
- requiring that a school representative actually communicate at least once each semester with an adult responsible for each child (Eastman), preferably in the home language;
- providing multicultural workshops for parents and teachers together;
- encouraging parents to work with teachers by volunteering in classes (Epstein);

- providing important information to parents on how the school system works, how they can support their children in the system, and what educational options are available to them;
- creating varied opportunities for parents and teachers to work together cooperatively (Comer, 1988) in classes, cultural activities, governance structures, and planning or management teams;
- ensuring that decisions are made by consensus rather than fiat (Comer);
- asking parents what they think of the school and the parent program, and acting in response;
- holding meetings outside of school, in community sites or parents' homes;
- Offering babysitting and translating at school functions;
- creating activities and opportunities for parents to come to school for good times as well as bad, positive recognition as well as negative.
- utilizing community networks and resources (organizations) as means of disseminating information and recruiting parents to school-related activities;
- forging ties with community organizations, clubs, churches, and businesses to create a network of resources and service providers for parents;
- utilizing varying strategies to organize Latino parents in recognition of their differing backgrounds and needs.

Although it should go without saying, schools should make efforts to have staff who can communicate with parents in their language; have informational materials in that language; and develop two-way bilingual programs to link monolingual and bilingual teachers and students (Carter and Chatfield).

D: Parents and Governance

Schools can and must involve parents in governance by:

- including parents and teachers in the school governance and management groups;
- ensuring a climate of respect towards parents and students;
- involving parents by having them do the needs assessment, help determine what needs to be done, and having them involved in the planning to address the needs identified.

There are a variety of models of schools and programs which demonstrate that Latino and other minority parents can be effectively involved in the education of their children and the governance of their children's schools. Some actions which New York City can undertake to support school/family and school/community linkages are:

E: Creating Settings for Learning in the Community

After-school, community-based settings for education and research may capitalize on Latino children's talents, resources, and skills. Moll and Diaz (1987) describe University-supported but community-based research centers in San Diego in which students can develop skills and conduct their own research and related activities in their communities. Through these centers, teachers can help youngsters learn and develop mastery of their language through active research and writing in their community about issues of concern. Similarly, adult members of the students' community are involved as respected sources of knowledge. The students' home language is used and developed as a means of communication, as is English.

Such school-college-community partnerships would require both collaboration and funding, but they promise to provide exciting research and educational opportunities for universities and students alike.

Although much more could be said on this topic, developing community service options and internships for students is a useful way to provide them with new learning opportunities and to link them with organizations and job possibilities in the wider society. Importantly, such opportunities help students to acquire new competencies, form new relationships, and redefine themselves in new ways.

F: Schools and Community Organizations: Forging Linkages

In New York's diverse communities, school leadership may for a variety of reasons fail to forge effective linkages with churches, service agencies, and other local organizations serving the community. Given the need to maximize the coordination and effectiveness of all those serving the youth of the City, this committee recommends a number of actions:

- each Community School District should be required to generate a current databank of local agencies, community-based organizations, and other local resources which would be available to parents and other concerned community members;
- the Board of Education should issue a policy statement on establishing community relationships and utilizing community resources as supports for students and their families;
- schools should be required to report to parents and the District the organizations, institutions, and agencies with whom they have working relationships. This pool of resources should be shared with parents and the community at large in the form of a list of services, activities, and other options available to them;
- the Board should mandate an "open school" week for community representatives and organizations to visit schools and meet with teachers, administrators, and staff;

- the Board should mandate that each school report, on a semi-annual basis, when, how, and by whom the building has been used for community-related functions. Each school should also maintain and report a list of all parties who have requested the use of the school, and the disposition of each request.
- the Board should mandate that each district report what outside funding was received, from what source, for what purposes, and to what school(s) the funding was allocated.
- the Board should ask each Community School District Superintendent to report, on an annual basis, whether the district has sought federal or city funds to provide activities for youth. If funds have not been sought, the Superintendent should be asked to explain why no proposals were developed, given that funds were available. In the latter event, each Superintendent should also be asked how the district plans to provide the activities from other funds.

Parents and students need to be better informed about community school board elections. Towards this end, the 1989 Social Studies Planning Guide, Grades 4-12, developed by the Office of Program and Curriculum Development and the Office of Community School District Affairs, entitled Community School Board Elections, should be revised according to any new changes implemented.

II. School/Work Linkages

Latino students and their families are very often not aware of the changing nature of work and its relationship to schooling. Neither is it clear that school personnel (teachers, counselors and administrators) fully understand the relative positions of Latinos vis a vis the U.S. and regional economic structure. A fuller comprehension of the larger picture might suggest clearer goals, a better understanding of students' career options and ways to achieve their objectives.

Latinos cannot remain locked into declining sectors of the U.S. economy. According to economist Richard Reich, the growing sectors of the U.S. and world economy will require people who can manipulate symbols (data, words, oral and visual presentations), move between the abstract and the concrete, and work in teams. Critical thinking and problem solving are key competencies needed for the workforce of tomorrow. Latino students must be exposed to an education that incorporates this reality. Furthermore, Latinos in the U.S. have to perceive themselves as an integral- not expendable- part of the global economic and cultural tradition.

In other words, schools must offer Latino students -- and all students -- ways of conceptualizing the future, and new, higher-order thinking and analytic skills that relate to the demands of the economy of the future.

Many Latino students leave or do poorly in school because schools and schooling appear to offer them no pathway to success or a viable connection to the world of the future. For schools to be perceived as relevant, they must try to connect students in meaningful ways with successful and future-oriented adult activity. This connectedness, however, cannot just be a gesture, nor should it connect students to employment which is likely to become irrelevant.

The 1991 report of the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) argues that the most effective learning occurs in context, in the application of knowledge to problem solving and working in "work-like" settings. With this in mind, this committee recommends the following models and approaches be considered for implementation in schools serving Latino students.

1) Schools can incorporate activities into their instruction which teach students to be successful by encouraging students to solve problems in the context of "real-world" activities:

- conducting opinion surveys,
- analyzing and presenting the outcomes to adult audiences,
- manufacturing and marketing products,
- "investing,"
- conducting scientific experiments,
- running a bank or a newspaper, or
- organizing research projects to inform local opinion of important environmental or other issues.
- harnessing alternative and new technologies to address local issues.

2) Schools can help Latino students to develop higher-level skills in English and Spanish by adding more activities which encourage:

- group presentations of work;
- oral presentations of work;
- the use of computation;
- group projects, problem solving, and collaboration.

At all points, the stress is on developing strengths and competencies through learning and application of skills in context.

3) Schools can organize projects outside of the regular instructional day as foci for learning and developing competencies. These might include:

- enhancing communication skills through translations; setting up a community translating service;
- organizing community art projects (murals, for example);
- Community theater projects with translations of major works in or into Spanish;
- Visual arts, poetry, magazine writing projects;
- film-making or oral history projects in the community;
- organizing student-run businesses (for example, a translating or babysitting service, food or delivery service);
- organizing farming or gardening projects;
- setting up community clean-up or other development projects;
- setting up a community newspaper, including investigative reporting and research features;
- conducting a needs assessment of local concerns;
- disseminating information for local school board elections;
- establishing a student volunteer corps, to help with tutoring younger students, assisting the elderly, and other community projects.

Projects and activities should explore a full range of human activities, ranging from literature and the arts to the humanities, natural and social sciences.

4) Latino students (and all students, for that matter) need to know about labor history and labor unions. What role did unions play in the struggles and accomplishments of working men and women in the United States? What role did their parents and grandparents play in

the development of labor unions in this country? Did involvement by the Latino community have an impact on labor history as well as the particular histories of our community? Was there a difference in the role Latina women played? Are unions important to the economic well being of our community and the future of this country? Speakers, films, and historical documents as well as interviews with community members and union representatives might be useful in these explorations. Useful materials include Teaching Labor Studies In The Schools, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Cornell Labor Studies, Amalgamated Clothing & Textile Workers Union Education Department; and Center for Puerto Rican Studies materials.

5) Because language issues are important for many Latino students, instruction may have to be modified for them as their needs may require. Supportive materials may need to be available in Spanish, as well as faculty who can provide instruction in Spanish or with an E.S.L. approach, as appropriate. In further support of instruction, providing a salary differential for bilingual teaching responsibilities would give official recognition of the fact that effective bilingual teaching requires additional preparation. (See, for example, the New York City Police Department, and the Los Angeles schools. For further discussion of this topic, please see the text of the instruction committee.)

6) Schools must forge links with companies where possible, because companies can be supportive of student learning by:

- providing technological tools for students to learn problem solving and creative thinking;
- providing mentors and role models for students;

- providing speakers who can demonstrate the relationship of schooling to work; and
- providing meaningful student internship opportunities in professional settings (see New York City's City As School program, for example).

7) Schools can be located on the premises of businesses or other institutions, providing students with opportunities to observe, understand, and work in the business or other institution. This might include colleges, newspapers, museums, zoos, or a city agency such as the Department of Transportation. The middle college concept is particularly relevant, with International High School as an example. As one student said, "kids are attracted to programs which relate to the future -- law and business; the Academy of Finance finds them summer jobs. Things like sports. Things which give an income."

8) Similar connections could be made without physically locating a school in a particular setting. Schools could be paired with city agencies or cultural institutions, including zoos, parks, historical, science and art museums. Again, students would be encouraged to observe, study, understand, and work in the institution. Instruction would incorporate the resources of the institution as sources for learning and developing competencies.

9) Because Latino students are disproportionately from low-income families, many feel a need to generate income (the quote in Section 7 above gives an example). This is especially the case for older students. To whatever degree possible, schools must be flexible in scheduling instruction in ways that allow students to work. Half-day and night high school schedules may be useful in this regard.

Students may feel a need to push ahead and make up for time towards graduation lost in learning English as a second language or in remedial classes. Students must be able to "double up" if they choose to, taking day and evening courses at the same time, and in sites accessible to their homes and places of work. New York's Auxiliary Services for the High Schools, with its flexible scheduling and both day and night classes, provides one model for accomplishing this. A final alternative is to offer accelerated classes within the normal high school instructional day, which would allow students to make up needed content courses as quickly as they can assimilate the course material.

10) As a related issue, schools should make every effort to provide opportunities to combine schooling and paid work, either through work-study, cooperative education, paid internships, or job-placement relationships with employers. Many students have adult responsibilities outside of school, and language competencies which should be respected. If schools recognize and build on this reality, it should help to strengthen the bond between student and school and maintain a school-work balance which will support students' academic progress and enhance their self esteem.

11) Through concerted outreach efforts, schools must affirm the school-work connection in such a way that parents understand its implications for students and their future. One means for establishing this is through use of the Central Park East "Post Graduation Plan" concept, agreed to by both parents and students years before graduation.

12) This committee recommends that the Board undertake a study to describe existing practices in middle and high schools: to what extent do students have the opportunity to explore subject areas in depth? To what degree are students given the opportunity to explore career possibilities through internships or other intensive experiences outside school? Which successful elementary and middle school models allow students to experience problem-solving and work experiences which are related to the future in a realistic way? This study should describe current practices and determine their relative effectiveness in light of the available research.

III. Self Esteem

Latino students report feeling vulnerable in the streets of their communities and unsafe on the way to school. They report counselors who are too busy to reach out to them, who do not speak their language, value their culture, or understand their experiences in New York. The students tell us that too many teachers are indifferent to whether they learn or not; that teachers implicitly expect them to fail.

More subtly, Latino students get numerous messages through staff expectations, the attitudes of non-Latino students, and the media that they are racially, culturally and linguistically marginal and will not "make it" into the professional world to which schooling is the door. As a result, Latino students become angry, or turn away from school. Their self esteem suffers, as does their academic performance.

Many of the recommendations we have made in the previous sections of this report relate to the issue of student self esteem -- linkages with families, issues of safety and security, intergroup relations, school and work linkages. This section addresses some issues related to self esteem in a more direct way, and reiterates that building self esteem comes from affirming and realizing that education is a process of adjusting programs to meet student needs.

Building self esteem comes from empowering students to help others. The Valued Youth program in Community School District 10, for example, pays older at-risk teens to tutor younger children, with benefits for both.

Self esteem comes from mastery -- as in Central Park East, it comes from building students' ability to think critically, to analyze information, to demonstrate knowledge.

Self esteem comes from a climate of understanding arising out of a sympathetic understanding of, and respect for, Latino students' cultures and experiences. Some sources of understanding include the New York State Curriculum of Inclusion and the New York State Task Force's Invisible People of Color.

In the words of one student, self esteem comes from teachers "...who take time with you...explain things. Teachers have to show they're there for you." "Good teachers who become friends with each kid -- build a relationship with each kid." In other words, self esteem grows when teachers care. One student says "[if] teachers are indifferent, class size isn't so important -- my English teacher says: "I care. I'm there for you -- call me if you need it." He feels that this teacher cares.

Teachers who don't respect students, who hold racist attitudes, may not even be aware of their behavior and how such attitudes can affect their judgement. To address these issues, teachers need better training and a good deal more self knowledge, as well as more information about Latino students' cultural backgrounds, and their experiences in New York. An understanding of the acculturation process is also essential. Neither can teachers assume our students' experiences are like ours: all adults who work with students need a greater awareness of what students are going through.

Students' self esteem is enhanced when they have positive role models in school, and when they see themselves validated in textbooks and related materials. Role models can come from many sources: Latino teachers and programs offered by community-based organizations in schools.

Students say they are hungry for more knowledge of their cultural backgrounds and historical roots; they are looking for cultural self knowledge. They want more active exposure to the arts and cultural activities involving themselves and their families. Sources of this information are numerous in New York, and include the Center for Puerto Rican Studies at Hunter College, the Puerto Rican Traveling Theater and the Caribbean Cultural Center.

Segregation of students also diminishes students' self esteem. When Latino students who are limited English proficient (LEP) are physically separated from other students, they can feel stigmatized ("the banana boat floor"). The separation can also be seen as protective, however, if the LEP students feel vulnerable and threatened by the others.

The Committee again recommends that LEP and English proficient, bilingual and monolingual students be served together in a two-way enrichment model which values the languages and incorporates the cultural backgrounds of all participants.

IV: Issues Related to Inter-Group Relations

The Commission feels that the Board must address the following issues:

1) Much of the violence occurring in and around our schools is minority on minority assault. This speaks to the need for early intervention strategies to create a more harmonious atmosphere.

2) Clearly, the Latino, African American and Asian communities have become increasingly diversified with newer immigrants joining Puerto Ricans, Blacks, and Chinese in the inner city schools. It is important that this diversity be recognized and not obscured under a minority or a Latino label. Traditional minorities are still encountering a legacy of forced incorporation and exclusion under increasingly difficult economic circumstances. Newer immigrants, with their own historical trajectory, are contending with finding a place in U.S. society that would improve upon the conditions faced in their homelands. One cannot assume, in

the convergence of all these groups, that any one group understands the experiences of the other.

3) There is much that can be affirmed, shared and explored in a school environment. The diversity lends itself to probing, questioning and problem-solving the differences and commonalities of the respective experiences. The linguistic wealth that these children and families bring to the schools must be harnessed or it will be a lost opportunity.

V. Security

Freedom from fear and intimidation is essential to promoting school achievement. Yet, Latino students report feeling increasingly vulnerable to danger and humiliation. The fact that the school safety program is only twenty years old attests to a more violent climate in and around our schools. Clearly, the rise in drug use and crime within increasingly impoverished inner city communities over the past few decades is a major factor. Neither is the rest of the country immune from this trend. Security, in fact, is one of the few growth industries as we move toward the twenty-first century.

Security, however, can be a double-edged sword. On the one hand, a visible security system serves as a deterrent to crime. On the other, it can project a penal climate. These contradictory factors need to be reconciled so that Latino students and parents can feel a reasonable degree of safety and hospitality in and around the school community. Schools must be secure and sustain an environment that promotes learning.

The School Safety Program has a formidable responsibility with limited resources. Metal detectors are in place for 20 of the 118 high schools. All New York City high schools have 5-12 School Safety Officers assigned to monitor entrances and the numerous exits of large school buildings. Middle schools are routinely assigned two officers and two-thirds of the elementary schools have one school safety officer in place. School safety officers carry walkie-talkies, are unarmed and can make arrests in and around the school perimeter.

While students report feeling safer with the security system in place, Latino students and parents decry a procedure that emphasizes everyone as suspect. The large size of the school and student population promotes an anonymity that is difficult to humanize. In addition, security delays in getting into school buildings frequently puts students at odds with teachers who have little sympathy for lateness. The relationship between the school safety officers and the rest of the school community is minimal at best.

Latino students also report increased "incidents" going to and from school which discourage and inhibit their school attendance. Students encounter verbal and physical abuse, hold-ups, as well as a drug traffic that actively recruits younger and younger children as a way to evade the judicial system. Parents are frequently placed in the position of keeping their children at home for fear of bodily harm; because school safety officers are limited to securing school buildings, efforts to coordinate their work with other agencies and uniformed services must be strengthened.

The following recommendations serve to address the contradictory nature of school security and to strengthen existing efforts in a holistic way:

- The link between the School Safety Officers and the school to which they are deployed needs to be strengthened. Principals are in need of security management training. Organized channels of communications should be pursued. Areas might include school-based management teams, parent and student organizations, faculty and community meetings. The integration of school safety officers into the school environment promotes a common understanding of the problems as well as concordance with proposed solutions.

- The training of School Safety Officers should include cultural and linguistic diversity issues along with child and adolescent development. While the force is largely minority, the increasing diversity of minority communities is not fully recognized or understood. It is imperative that attention be paid to the complexities that these communities face-as traditional minorities and as newer immigrants. School safety officers are frequently the first official encounter with the school environment. It is crucial that this encounter encourage a positive school-home connection.

- Efforts to reduce school size into more manageable units should be encouraged. Familiarity promotes understanding and trust. Greater attentiveness can be given to individual and group strengths. In addition, emerging difficulties can readily be identified and responded to.

- Proactive activities should be enhanced. Students need to be exposed to models of resolving conflicts without violence. Problem solving, conflict resolution strategies, crisis prevention and intervention should be weaved into the school curriculum. Differences in views, opinions, characteristics, etc. should be shared and respected. From the acknowledgment of difference, common threads should then emerge.

- On-going links with police, transit police, drug enforcement agencies, merchants, community agencies need to be augmented. Links with school safety officers and the school community can promote locally-based models or strategies for providing students in transit a safe passage. The ebbs and flows of community activities should be monitored.

- Someone in the school should be designated to collect reports of incidents in the neighborhood. These should be transmitted on a regular basis to the police precinct.
- The New York City Transit Police School Outreach Program was established in 1987. Its goal is to improve relations between student, school officials, and transit police officers. The New York City Police Department has a community liaison officer assigned per precinct and the New York City Housing Police give talks on safety in public housing. It is essential that administrators become aware of the resources available to them from the different security agencies in order to better meet the needs of their students.

Overall, the Board needs to address and/or counteract the violence projected by the media via newspapers, radio, television and film. A program of conflict resolution through peaceful means must be integrated into the general curriculum. Support personnel, counselors and CBO's should go into the classrooms and respond to the issues of race, gender and class relations that students daily face.

APPENDICES

STATEMENT FROM
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

The Board of Education has established a Latino Commission on Educational Reform. The Commission will address issues of concern to Latino school children and will make recommendations to help the Board fulfill its commitment to Latino students.

The Commission will be chaired by Board member Dr. Luis Reyes. Members will include representatives from educational institutions, service agencies and government offices.

Sub-committees of the Commission will be created to focus on:

- research and analysis on the causes and solution to the Latino dropout crisis
- Curriculum and instruction
- student counseling and support services
- parent and community empowerment
- other factors affecting Latino students' achievement.

The Commission was established to ensure that the growing numbers of Latino students are receiving appropriate, quality instruction in conditions conducive to education. Latino students currently comprise 35% of the student population in New York City. Their backgrounds are diverse, and their needs are complex and varied.

In recent years, several initiatives have enhanced Latino students' education experience. Monitoring and enforcement of mandates for the bilingual/ESL program has brought the compliance rate above 95% Increasing numbers of Latino and bilingual staff have been hired. Project Achieve--a dropout prevention program for high schools--puts special emphasis on Latino youngsters, as does the Implementation Plan for the Working Group on Math Education.

While much progress has been made, dropout rates for Latino students remain higher than citywide averages. If these students are to achieve their full potential, it is vital that programs and services be designed to meet their unique needs and tap their extraordinary resources.

Commission recommendations will be developed with full recognition of the constraints on the school system. Specific recommendations will aim to provide maximum services within budgetary limitations. The Commission may also address large social issues that hinder educational progress. In particular, programs to benefit Latino students must acknowledge the overwhelming poverty that cripples so many lives.

The Latino Commission on Educational Reform will report to the Board and the Chancellor within six months with specific recommendations to develop solutions to problems that threaten the progress of Latino students.

GLOSSARY
AND N.Y.C. BOARD OF EDUCATION ACRONYMS

- AIDP - Attendance Improvement & Dropout Prevention - state funded program with the purpose of improving attendance for eligible students at risk of dropping out.

- Alternative High Schools - are smaller than most high schools and emphasize academic and personal support.

- BASIS - Brooklyn and Staten Island Schools

- CAPS - Community Achievement Project in the Schools - a program designed to reduce the school dropout rate among at risk students.

- CBO - Community Based Organization

- LEP - limited English proficient students whose native language is other than English are provided with English as a Second Language Programs and often get supplementary support services.

- "Math 24" Game - a new Math game introduced to N.Y.C. in 1990-91 which has been found to stimulate student interest in Math, has motivated students to learn basis skills, has developed problem exploration and thinking and communication skills.

- OREA - Office of Research & Educational Assessment - Unit responsible for evaluations and administration of tests.

- SBM/SDM - School-Based Management & Shared Decision-Making - N.Y.C. Board of Education Model for school level decision-making.

- Tab - procedure used in contract bidding up to $15,000.00

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL DATA SERVICES
TABLE 1
ANNUAL PUPIL ETHNIC CENSUS
CITY-WIDE BY SCHOOL LEVEL
OCTOBER 31, 1990

LEVEL	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE		ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN				TOTAL	
							BLACK		WHITE			
ELEMENTARY	329	0.1%	36,951	7.6%	179,312	36.8%	177,258	36.4%	92,922	19.1%	486,772	100.0%
JHS-INTER.	175	0.1%	14,345	7.6%	67,073	35.3%	72,111	38.0%	36,065	19.0%	189,769	100.0%
HIGH SCHOOLS	246	0.1%	23,998	9.1%	83,170	31.5%	105,981	40.1%	50,836	19.2%	264,231	100.0%
ACADEMIC	191	0.1%	21,170	10.1%	62,888	29.9%	80,363	38.2%	45,582	21.7%	210,194	100.0%
VOCATIONAL	22	0.1%	1,123	4.1%	10,672	38.8%	13,498	49.0%	2,219	8.1%	27,534	100.0%
ALTERNATIVE	32	0.1%	1,685	6.7%	9,124	36.2%	11,430	45.3%	2,942	11.7%	25,213 **	100.0%
GED PROGRAMS	1	0.1%	20	1.6%	486	37.7%	690	53.5%	93	7.2%	1,290	100.0%
SPEC ED SCHOOLS	7	0.0% *	341	2.3%	4,613	31.3%	7,707	52.3%	2,074	14.1%	14,742	100.0%
TOTAL	757	0.1%	75,635	7.9%	334,168	35.0%	363,057	38.0%	181,897	19.0%	955,514	100.0%

OCTOBER 31, 1989

LEVEL	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE		ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN				TOTAL	
							BLACK		WHITE			
ELEMENTARY	332	0.1%	34,808	7.3%	175,851	36.7%	176,079	36.7%	92,559	19.3%	479,629	100.0%
JHS-INTER.	116	0.1%	13,960	7.5%	65,503	35.1%	71,601	38.4%	35,333	18.9%	186,513	100.0%
HIGH SCHOOLS	202	0.1%	22,865	8.9%	78,545	30.4%	104,116	40.4%	52,235	20.2%	257,963	100.0%
ACADEMIC	158	0.1%	20,546	9.8%	61,055	29.2%	80,307	38.5%	46,755	22.4%	208,821	100.0%
VOCATIONAL	31	0.1%	1,163	4.3%	10,188	37.2%	13,190	48.2%	2,782	10.2%	27,354	100.0%
ALTERNATIVE	12	0.1%	1,144	5.5%	6,961	33.5%	10,063	48.4%	2,592	12.5%	20,772 **	100.0%
GED PROGRAMS	1	0.1%	12	1.2%	341	33.6%	556	54.7%	106	10.4%	1,016	100.0%
SPEC ED SCHOOLS	16	0.1%	330	2.3%	4,592	31.6%	7,493	51.5%	2,109	14.5%	14,540	100.0%
TOTAL	666	0.1%	71,963	7.7%	324,491	34.6%	359,289	38.3%	182,236	19.4%	938,645	100.0%

*LESS THAN 1/10TH OF ONE PERCENT
**INCLUDES NIGHT HIGH SCHOOLS, OUTREACH, PREGNANT, AUXILIARY SERVICES, AND OFFSITE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL DATA SERVICES
TABLE 5
ANNUAL PUPIL ETHNIC CENSUS - NUMBER AND PERCENT BY REGISTER
SCHOOL YEARS 1967-1990 - ALL SCHOOLS

YEAR	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE		ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER		PUERTO RICAN [1]		HISPANIC		OTHER SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN		NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN BLACK		WHITE [2]		TOTAL REGISTER	
1967					244,458	22.0%					333,769	30.1%	531,437	47.9%	1,109,664	100.0%
1968	321	0.0% *	14,917	1.3%	240,746	21.5%			29,697	2.6%	361,480	32.2%	474,761	42.3%	1,121,922	100.0%
1969	289	0.0% *	16,094	1.4%	249,055	22.2%			33,574	3.0%	376,948	33.6%	447,205	39.8%	1,123,165	100.0%
1970	349	0.0% *	17,491	1.5%	260,040	22.8%			39,240	3.4%	392,714	34.4%	431,241	37.8%	1,141,075	100.0%
1971	363	0.0% *	18,931	1.7%	265,923	23.2%			42,093	3.7%	402,187	35.1%	416,963	36.4%	1,146,460	100.0%
1972	413	0.0% *	20,452	1.8%	259,849	23.0%			43,614	3.9%	406,974	36.0%	397,694	35.2%	1,128,996	100.0%
1973	463	0.0% *	22,067	2.0%	256,095	23.1%			43,199	3.9%	405,311	36.6%	379,726	34.3%	1,106,861	100.0%
1974	577	0.1%	23,252	2.1%	253,452	23.0%			54,392	4.9%	403,064	36.6%	365,487	33.2%	1,100,224	100.0%
1975	743	0.1%	24,277	2.2%	256,278	23.3%			54,270	4.9%	410,321	37.3%	353,115	32.1%	1,099,004	100.0%
1976	486	0.0% *	27,824	2.6%	254,002	23.6%			58,370	5.4%	408,444	37.9%	328,065	30.5%	1,077,191	100.0%
1977	496	0.0% *	30,408	2.9%	244,844	23.6%			59,483	5.7%	394,894	38.1%	306,118	29.5%	1,036,243	100.0%
1978	525	0.1%	32,377	3.2%			294,792	29.5%			384,735	38.5%	286,518	28.7%	998,947	100.0%
1979	446	0.0% *	36,339	3.8%			286,664	29.8%			371,556	38.6%	268,043	27.8%	963,048	100.0%
1980	476	0.1%	38,197	4.0%			287,494	30.5%			363,948	38.6%	253,690	26.9%	943,805	100.0%
1981	479	0.1%	40,626	4.4%			287,173	31.1%			356,441	38.6%	239,496	25.9%	924,215	100.0%
1982	377	0.0% *	44,614	4.9%			292,124	31.8%			353,238	38.5%	228,031	24.8%	918,384	100.0%
1983	509	0.1%	49,316	5.3%			300,926	32.5%			354,974	38.4%	219,117	23.7%	924,842	100.0%
1984	675	0.1%	54,287	5.8%			308,906	33.2%			355,763	38.2%	212,137	22.8%	931,768	100.0%
1985	586	0.1%	57,631	6.2%			314,748	33.6%			356,933	38.1%	206,333	22.0%	936,231	100.0%
1986	680	0.1%	61,688	6.6%			318,431	33.9%			358,254	38.1%	200,089	21.3%	939,142	100.0%
1987	823	0.1%	65,166	6.9%			319,216	34.0%			361,473	38.5%	193,255	20.6%	939,933	100.0%
1988	891	0.1%	68,441	7.3%			321,292	34.3%			359,363	38.4%	186,166	19.9%	936,153	100.0%
1989	666	0.1%	71,963	7.7%			324,491	34.6%			359,289	38.3%	182,236	19.4%	938,645	100.0%
1990	757	0.1%	75,635	7.9%			334,168	35.0%			363,057	38.0%	181,897	19.0%	955,514	100.0%

NOTES:

1. In 1967 the ethnic category "Puerto Rican" included some "Other Spanish Surname American" pupils.
2. In 1967 the ethnic category "White" was called "Other" and included "American Indian", "Asian" and some "Other Spanish Surnamed American" pupils.

* Less than 1/10th of one percent.

Four-Year Latino Cohort Dropout Rates for the Class of 1990

SBORO	BDS	School Name	Four-Year Cohort Dropout Rates Total Dropout Rate	Latino Dropout Rate	1990-91 School Year # of Latino Students	% of All Students Who are Latino
6	378565	H. S. of Redirection	48.7%	66.9%	41	7.6%
6	378575	Street Academy	26.3%	47.1%	22	6.8%
6	478535	Island Academy	36.5%	46.2%	82	26.1%
1	178480	Julia Richman	31.2%	41.3%	1,020	34.3%
6	178570	Satellite Academy	30.2%	40.6%	365	47.6%
5	378455	Boys and Girls	31.2%	39.0%	304	7.8%
6	578470	Concord	30.5%	38.4%	46	17.8%
1	178445	Seward Park	24.2%	36.8%	1,339	44.5%
6	178495	Park East	37.1%	35.4%	258	66.5%
2	278430	Walton	25.4%	33.0%	1,599	54.6%
2	278410	Wm. H. Taft	25.4%	32.8%	1,389	53.2%
1	178465	George Washington	30.3%	32.3%	2,938	86.7%
5	578455	Tottenville	11.9%	31.8%	146	6.3%
5	378490	Fort Hamilton	25.5%	31.5%	1,195	36.7%
2	278470	South Bronx	30.5%	30.7%	928	91.2%
3	378435	Thomas Jefferson	33.9%	29.8%	423	20.5%
5	378655	Sarah J. Hale	21.8%	28.5%	331	18.0%
2	278440	DeWitt Clinton	23.0%	28.5%	1,801	52.6%
1	178535	Park West	25.3%	28.3%	1,093	54.0%
2	278415	Christopher Columbus	18.1%	28.3%	1,128	40.5%
5	378475	Eastern District	28.9%	27.8%	2,011	75.4%
1	178490	Martin Luther King, Jr.	24.7%	27.3%	652	20.9%
2	278450	Adlai E. Stevenson	23.4%	26.6%	2,072	56.4%
1	178660	Mabel D. Bacon	18.4%	25.8%	559	46.6%
1	178625	Graphic Comm. Arts	20.7%	25.7%	476	31.1%
2	278435	Theodore Roosevelt	23.7%	25.5%	2,112	61.0%
4	378420	Franklin K. Lane	25.0%	25.2%	1,964	47.7%
3	378480	Bushwick	23.0%	25.1%	1,559	74.1%
3	378440	Prospect Heights	24.9%	24.6%	101	5.0%
1	178470	Louis D. Brandeis	24.8%	24.6%	1,379	56.3%
2	278425	Evander Childs	20.7%	24.6%	1,053	36.2%
6	178515	Lower East Side Prep	23.4%	24.5%	71	12.5%
2	278405	Herbert H. Lehman	20.5%	24.4%	719	31.7%
2	278420	James Monroe	20.9%	23.9%	1,683	67.9%
2	278400	Morris	24.4%	23.3%	1,083	59.5%
1	178460	Washington Irving	20.9%	22.8%	715	36.1%
4	478465	Far Rockaway	22.7%	22.3%	438	26.8%
1	178600	Fashion Industries	17.3%	22.2%	990	48.6%
5	378400	Lafayette	20.1%	22.1%	492	16.9%
5	378610	Automotive	21.2%	21.6%	411	32.9%
5	378460	John Jay	14.7%	21.3%	1,437	47.2%
2	278600	Alfred E. Smith	18.1%	21.0%	788	58.2%
4	478410	Beach Channel	17.7%	20.9%	477	22.2%
2	278650	Jane Addams	19.3%	20.9%	728	45.6%
5	378410	Abraham Lincoln	16.2%	20.5%	431	18.3%

SBORO: 1 = Manhattan; 2 = Bronx; 3 = Brooklyn; 4 = Queens; 5 = BASIS; 6 = Alternative High Schools

			Four-Year Cohort Dropout Rates		1990-91 School Year	
SBORO	BDS	School Name	Total Dropout Rate	Latino Dropout Rate	# of Latino Students	% of All Students Who are Latino
3	378465	Erasmus Hall	16.5%	19.7%	184	6.1%
3	378445	New Utrecht	13.5%	19.3%	350	13.2%
2	278475	John F. Kennedy	16.9%	18.8%	2,937	64.0%
4	478480	John Adams	13.9%	18.2%	670	25.4%
6	178550	Liberty H. S.	19.7%	17.5%	484	76.3%
1	178440	Humanities	12.5%	17.4%	559	30.1%
3	378470	George W. Wingate	15.5%	17.3%	181	7.3%
6	278480	Bronx Regional	16.0%	17.1%	154	41.0%
4	478475	Richmond Hill	18.0%	16.8%	744	34.9%
5	578445	Port Richmond	9.5%	16.8%	199	10.4%
2	278660	Grace H. Dodge	15.2%	16.5%	748	54.3%
4	478445	William C. Bryant	12.9%	16.5%	1,036	33.5%
4	478505	Hillcrest	8.5%	16.3%	735	22.4%
4	478460	Flushing	14.6%	16.3%	864	41.4%
4	478600	Queens Vocational	16.6%	15.9%	531	51.1%
4	478450	Long Island City	11.8%	15.8%	701	36.1%
3	378615	East New York	19.5%	15.3%	176	16.9%
5	378620	William E. Grady	11.4%	14.8%	288	21.7%
5	378605	George Westinghouse	12.0%	14.3%	369	21.2%
3	378505	F. D. Roosevelt	14.0%	13.5%	962	27.2%
3	378500	Canarsie	7.0%	13.5%	378	15.5%
2	278655	Samuel Gompers	14.5%	13.3%	532	46.3%
5	578460	Susan E. Wagner	9.6%	13.1%	154	6.7%
3	378660	William H. Maxwell	15.1%	13.1%	375	29.3%
4	478470	Jamaica	7.3%	12.9%	417	16.4%
4	478485	Grover Cleveland	9.8%	12.8%	964	35.7%
1	178520	Murry Bergtraum	8.8%	12.8%	897	34.6%
5	578440	New Dorp	16.4%	12.2%	223	10.2%
3	378495	Sheepshead Bay	11.7%	12.2%	315	11.8%
5	578600	Ralph McKee	11.7%	12.1%	100	12.4%
5	378485	Telecomm. Arts & Tech.	7.0%	11.9%	415	42.7%
4	478455	Newtown	12.9%	11.4%	2,210	56.8%
4	478430	Francis Lewis	10.3%	11.4%	421	17.5%
1	178620	Norman Thomas	10.2%	11.2%	1,542	51.9%
1	178615	Chelsea	13.4%	11.0%	443	44.9%
2	278455	Harry S. Truman	8.9%	10.6%	495	20.9%
5	578450	Curtis	13.3%	10.5%	292	15.5%
3	378625	Paul Robeson	3.9%	10.3%	86	6.8%
4	478440	Forest Hills	9.9%	10.1%	474	17.8%
4	478420	Springfield Gardens	11.0%	9.8%	72	2.9%
4	478425	John Bowne	9.2%	9.4%	1,085	39.9%
3	378600	Clara Barton	5.9%	9.4%	338	14.5%
4	478610	Aviation	6.9%	8.7%	1,164	57.7%
6	378555	Brooklyn College Acad.	9.6%	8.3%	29	11.2%
3	378405	Midwood	4.7%	7.0%	260	9.5%

SBORO: 1 = Manhattan; 2 = Bronx; 3 = Brooklyn; 4 = Queens; 5 = BASIS; 6 = Alternative High Schools

SBORO	BDS	School Name	Four-Year Cohort Dropout Rates		1990-91 School Year	
			Total Dropout Rate	Latino Dropout Rate	# of Latino Students	% of All Students Who are Latino
4	478435	Martin van Buren	5.5%	6.8%	431	19.4%
3	378540	John Dewey	5.0%	6.4%	702	22.9%
3	378525	Edward R. Murrow	3.8%	6.3%	502	15.5%
1	178630	Art & Design	5.7%	6.0%	677	39.2%
4	478495	Bayside	5.7%	5.9%	257	13.1%
3	378425	James Madison	5.4%	5.7%	305	11.5%
1	178485	F. H. LaGuardia	5.7%	5.4%	494	21.1%
3	378515	South Shore	8.4%	5.1%	232	8.0%
1	178435	Manhattan Math & Sci.	5.6%	5.1%	560	44.0%
4	478620	Thomas A. Edison	7.5%	4.4%	395	19.6%
3	378415	Samuel J. Tilden	15.9%	4.2%	85	3.1%
4	478415	Benjamin Cardozo	3.1%	2.9%	279	8.5%
1	178540	A. Philip Randolph	3.3%	2.8%	348	27.4%
4	478490	Andrew Jackson	14.9%	2.7%	58	2.5%
5	378430	Brooklyn Technical	1.9%	2.0%	661	14.5%
4	478400	August Martin	7.8%	1.0%	210	11.4%
1	178475	Stuyvesant	0.1%	0.0%	105	3.9%
2	278445	Bx. HS of Science	0.6%	0.0%	267	8.8%
4	478525	Townsend Harris	0.0%	0.0%	85	9.9%
6	178505	West Side	27.0%	N/A	232	35.9%
6	178560	City-as-School	11.1%	N/A	244	31.8%
1	178575	Man. Comp. Night HS	34.2%	N/A	164	41.1%
6	178585	Career Employment	44.3%	N/A	313	36.1%
6	278490	Phoenix School	20.2%	N/A	31	18.8%
6	278495	University Heights	13.6%	N/A	189	53.7%
6	278500	Hostos-Lincoln Academy	2.9%	N/A	214	72.3%
6	378520	Pacific	16.9%	N/A	72	16.7%
3	378640	Harry van Arsdale	3.4%	N/A	752	46.6%
3	378665	NYC Voc. Train. Center	10.8%	N/A	177	38.7%
6	478520	Middle College	24.2%	N/A	246	46.7%
6	478530	International H.S.	6.8%	N/A	214	48.5%
5	578605	Staten Island Technical	0.0%	N/A	31	5.1%

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
RANKED BY CONCENTRATION
OF LATINO STUDENTS

1990-91
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

District	% Students Who Are Latino	Building Utilization	Attendance	Free Lunch Eligibility	% Reading At or Above Grade Level 1989	1990	1991
18	6.1	122.2	93.0	50.2	57.3	56.0	58.3
26	7.8	89.1	94.5	11.8	78.1	78.9	83.2
31	10.2	91.7	92.6	25.1	65.7	64.7	66.9
17	10.5	135.5	90.0	83.2	48.4	44.8	47.8
16	10.6	79.8	88.2	84.0	48.7	46.4	47.0
22	11.7	115.9	91.7	44.2	57.8	57.8	59.5
29	13.9	118.8	91.6	50.7	51.7	53.6	58.6
23	17.3	85.8	86.5	78.8	36.9	34.7	38.5
13	17.5	89.9	90.5	75.5	47.1	45.3	47.9
25	20.0	99.7	93.2	29.2	66.1	64.3	69.3
21	21.0	92.3	89.9	57.8	53.0	54.0	59.8
28	21.5	115.4	90.6	53.6	53.9	54.1	59.2
05	21.7	89.6	86.4	77.6	29.9	28.4	32.0
02	23.5	88.9	92.1	48.4	55.7	57.4	61.0
27	23.5	114.9	90.5	53.8	48.8	48.1	49.1
20	24.1	91.2	91.6	46.2	56.6	58.7	59.7
11	29.3	107.2	91.4	52.4	55.1	54.7	53.0
03	37.5	84.7	89.8	73.2	36.0	36.2	38.8
30	40.6	108.5	92.1	52.6	51.9	52.2	56.7
19	42.3	101.7	89.9	78.2	37.4	38.1	39.5
24	47.5	141.4	91.9	49.0	48.6	48.9	51.3
15	56.3	104.0	91.3	67.2	48.5	47.8	51.1
08	56.5	98.7	88.4	72.6	42.4	39.6	42.8
09	56.7	110.2	86.9	88.9	29.4	29.8	33.6
04	61.8	84.4	87.9	76.0	39.7	38.9	42.4
10	63.3	139.5	88.4	80.0	36.0	34.8	37.1
12	66.2	93.4	88.1	81.4	36.2	36.6	35.6
07	68.0	79.2	88.0	81.6	31.9	33.5	35.0
14	69.1	83.2	90.0	82.3	45.3	47.1	49.0
32	71.5	109.7	89.0	87.2	32.1	29.6	33.2
01	74.7	73.7	89.3	86.1	33.2	35.6	36.7
06	87.1	155.6	89.5	76.4	34.8	35.1	36.5

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
RANKED BY CONCENTRATION
OF LATINO STUDENTS

1990-91
MIDDLE SCHOOLS

District	% Students Who Are Latino	Building Utilization	Attendance	Free Lunch Eligibility	% Reading At or Above Grade Level		
					1989	1990	1991
18	6.0	92.4	91.0	58.3	56.2	53.8	53.0
17	8.2	102.2	85.4	51.8	35.7	37.4	36.3
22	8.8	104.8	89.8	30.8	59.9	61.2	61.3
31	8.9	74.6	91.1	24.1	62.0	61.6	62.0
26	9.6	78.4	93.6	13.4	79.2	79.3	79.5
16	10.8	62.3	78.4	52.0	30.8	34.1	31.0
29	11.4	102.1	88.1	46.6	46.7	48.6	49.9
13	13.0	64.5	85.9	66.7	46.7	48.3	46.8
23	15.7	79.9	80.6	69.1	31.3	30.5	31.3
21	17.0	79.8	85.2	47.7	56.8	56.7	61.3
25	20.0	85.9	90.4	28.8	69.2	68.7	69.7
28	20.3	78.5	84.6	40.5	57.6	57.1	62.2
27	24.0	97.2	85.9	37.5	47.4	45.4	46.2
02	25.2	74.3	89.4	43.3	58.8	58.6	59.5
11	27.8	97.3	87.8	46.8	54.3	54.0	54.1
05	28.5	72.4	80.9	47.2	30.6	29.7	28.6
20	30.6	106.5	88.5	54.7	47.5	48.8	50.4
30	41.8	100.7	88.5	56.7	49.6	51.9	53.4
19	42.1	77.5	83.8	67.9	44.3	43.3	42.2
03	42.5	109.5	86.6	42.6	43.0	40.1	45.7
24	45.4	129.2	89.4	49.9	47.6	47.4	47.5
09	51.3	86.3	83.6	62.9	31.9	32.7	31.2
08	56.3	63.2	84.5	65.7	41.8	43.9	43.6
04	56.4	106.5	84.0	54.5	43.7	42.3	44.2
15	58.1	77.8	85.2	57.1	44.9	44.8	46.6
10	60.9	117.7	83.3	70.4	40.2	38.2	39.4
32	63.4	79.2	84.4	66.2	41.3	44.1	45.5
12	63.9	63.2	81.1	75.7	28.4	28.8	28.6
07	66.3	56.4	87.0	68.3	33.4	32.7	34.4
14	68.7	68.6	84.6	82.7	38.9	38.5	39.1
01	72.3	66.7	84.5	68.9	37.3	34.6	36.3
06	84.3	115.6	86.7	72.2	40.3	44.5	47.6

HIGH SCHOOLS
RANKED BY CONCENTRATION OF LATINO STUDENTS

1990-91

Name	% Students Who Are Latino	Cohort	Hispanic Dropout Rate	Building Utilization	Attendance	Free Lunch Eligibility	% Reading At or Above Grade Level 1989	1990	1991
Andrew Jackson	2.5	14.9	2.7	97.0	83.7	15.3	39.9	31.8	44.2
Springfield Gardens	2.9	11.0	9.8	120.0	86.2	14.3	47.1	41.1	47.8
Samuel J. Tilden	3.1	15.9	4.2	131.0	85.8	15.5	46.9	36.8	46.7
Stuyvesant	3.9	.1	.0	136.0	93.3	13.5	.	.	.
Tottenville	4.3	11.9	31.8	113.0	90.2	2.8	70.4	69.7	73.8
Prospect Heights	5.0	24.9	24.6	107.0	81.9	9.5	36.9	24.4	38.8
Staten Island Technical	5.1	.0	.	51.0	94.4	6.3	95.8	97.9	.
Erasmus Hall	6.1	16.5	19.7	123.0	84.6	21.7	34.8	29.8	36.2
Susan E. Wagner	6.7	9.6	13.1	88.0	89.4	11.4	66.6	57.3	64.0
Street Academy in B'klyn	6.8	26.6	47.1	.	53.5	31.1	14.0	11.3	21.0
Paul Robeson	6.8	3.9	10.3	96.0	87.2	23.6	61.2	51.7	47.0
George W. Wingate	7.3	15.5	17.3	118.0	84.5	21.1	30.5	25.1	33.4
H.S. of Redirection	7.6	48.7	66.9	.	62.5	61.4	23.6	16.8	24.5
Boys and Girls	7.8	31.2	39.0	116.0	80.0	27.8	38.8	31.8	45.5
South Shore	8.0	8.4	5.1	96.0	88.0	10.7	69.0	61.6	69.4
Benjamin Cardozo	8.5	3.1	2.9	137.0	91.3	7.8	87.1	84.5	86.7
Bronx H.S. of Science	8.8	.6	.0	126.0	94.8	7.8	.	.	.
Midwood	9.5	4.7	7.0	147.0	92.0	12.3	84.8	82.0	83.9
Townsend Harris	9.9	.0	.0	164.0	95.2	9.0	99.3	98.1	100.0
New Dorp	10.2	16.3	12.2	74.0	87.1	18.9	54.7	46.3	51.1
Port Richmond	10.4	9.5	16.8	109.0	88.8	7.6	66.8	65.8	68.0
B'klyn College Academy	11.2	9.6	8.3	.	79.1	7.3	74.0	66.9	71.0
August Martin	11.4	7.8	1.0	81.0	88.5	23.6	58.6	49.4	62.5
James Madison	11.5	5.4	5.7	116.0	89.6	13.0	65.8	66.5	71.8
Sheepshead Bay	11.8	11.7	12.2	107.0	84.7	15.4	65.3	60.7	69.6
Ralph McKee	12.4	11.7	12.1	111.0	86.1	21.9	40.2	30.8	38.5
Lower East Side Prep	12.5	23.4	24.5	.	83.8	76.8	20.3	14.9	29.4
Bayside	13.1	5.7	5.9	86.0	86.8	11.9	77.4	67.3	82.3
New Utrecht	13.2	13.5	19.3	133.0	86.7	19.9	60.5	53.5	57.3
Clara Barton	14.5	5.9	9.4	129.0	88.7	44.1	61.7	55.0	65.7
Brooklyn Technical	14.5	1.9	2.0	110.0	92.7	23.7	.	.	.

Name	% Students Who Are Latino	Cohort	Hispanic Dropout Rate	Building Utilization	Attendance	Free Lunch Eligibility	% Reading At or Above Grade Level 1989	1990	1991
Edward R. Murrow	15.5	3.8	6.3	114.0	89.9	16.5	76.9	74.2	82.7
Curtis	15.5	13.3	10.5	120.0	85.1	20.7	64.2	59.0	66.7
Canarsie	15.5	7.0	13.5	132.0	85.0	17.6	63.2	56.5	65.2
Jamaica	16.4	7.3	12.9	113.0	87.3	14.5	67.3	60.9	66.9
Pacific	16.7	17.0	.	.	62.1	62.2	44.1	37.2	43.2
East New York	16.9	19.5	15.3	107.0	88.2	45.8	50.4	49.6	67.5
Lafayette	16.9	20.1	22.1	118.0	82.7	13.9	53.3	52.3	63.0
Francis Lewis	17.5	10.3	11.4	135.0	88.6	14.0	72.3	67.2	73.6
Forest Hills	17.8	9.9	10.1	125.0	89.9	19.8	76.5	74.9	77.7
Concord	17.8	30.5	38.4	.	73.1	18.6	32.0	35.5	51.3
Sarah J. Hale	18.0	21.8	28.5	99.0	80.4	25.5	35.1	28.5	39.0
Abraham Lincoln	18.3	16.2	20.5	104.0	84.3	30.7	68.0	61.2	56.3
Martin Van Buren	19.4	5.6	6.8	101.0	88.8	14.4	68.9	68.2	75.3
Thomas A. Edison	19.6	7.5	4.4	131.0	86.9	20.6	71.5	64.2	73.4
Thomas Jefferson	20.5	34.0	29.8	97.0	74.7	18.9	27.1	25.1	35.7
Harry S. Truman	20.9	8.9	10.6	77.0	85.7	9.3	60.9	53.2	58.8
Martin Luther King, Jr.	20.9	24.7	27.3	129.0	78.0	35.9	50.9	43.5	53.4
Fiorello H. LaGuardia	21.1	5.7	5.4	96.0	89.4	19.7	90.7	87.4	89.5
George Westinghouse	21.2	12.0	14.3	99.0	83.1	31.0	56.4	51.1	59.9
William Grady	21.7	11.4	14.8	95.0	87.8	40.5	55.7	43.5	57.6
Beach Channel	22.2	17.7	20.9	75.0	85.3	6.7	56.2	45.7	52.1
Hillcrest	22.4	8.6	16.3	119.0	85.5	25.7	62.9	57.8	70.3
John Dewey	22.9	5.0	6.4	160.0	91.2	36.1	74.3	63.8	68.4
John Adams	25.4	13.9	18.2	114.0	87.5	14.1	50.4	42.4	49.4
Far Rockaway	26.8	22.8	22.3	85.0	86.3	9.0	41.6	28.6	36.6
Franklin D. Roosevelt	27.2	14.0	13.5	147.0	86.5	37.3	56.0	49.0	58.3
A. Philip Randolph	27.4	3.3	2.8	75.0	90.0	49.0	87.8	80.9	91.8
William H. Maxwell	29.3	15.1	13.1	141.0	85.3	27.1	34.1	28.9	35.8
Humanities	30.1	12.5	17.4	109.0	85.7	28.5	69.9	68.6	66.8
Graphic Communication Art	31.1	20.7	25.7	98.0	83.5	30.3	60.2	51.7	58.5
Herbert H. Lehman	31.7	20.5	24.4	78.0	83.2	14.1	67.0	55.8	65.0
City As School	31.8	11.1	.	.	87.1	3.3	.	.	.
Automotive	32.9	21.2	21.6	135.0	78.4	41.2	34.5	29.7	38.2
William C. Bryant	33.5	12.9	16.5	125.0	89.8	21.7	64.4	53.1	63.9
Julia Richman	34.1	31.2	41.3	122.0	78.1	45.8	37.6	37.3	43.6
Murry Bergtraum	34.6	8.8	12.8	103.0	86.9	46.4	58.8	52.9	67.1

Name	% Students Who Are Latino	Cohort	Hispanic Dropout Rate	Building Utilization	Attendance	Free Lunch Eligibility	% Reading At or Above Grade Level 1989	1990	1991
Richmond Hill	34.9	18.0	16.8	129.0	87.4	31.4	52.3	49.5	54.6
Grover Cleveland	35.7	9.8	12.8	111.0	89.2	17.2	53.3	49.9	59.1
R. Green HS of Teaching	35.8	.0	.	94.0	85.5	40.8	.	67.0	73.6
West Side	35.9	27.1	.	.	74.7	67.8	.	20.9	28.0
Washington Irving	36.1	20.9	22.8	83.0	80.8	30.0	40.4	37.2	46.0
Long Island City	36.1	11.8	15.8	129.0	85.2	6.3	61.4	53.9	54.2
Career Employment Center	36.1	44.6	.	.	81.2	47.3	.	.	24.1
Evander Childs	36.2	20.8	24.6	94.0	82.2	.9	46.0	34.9	40.2
Fort Hamilton	36.7	25.5	31.5	157.0	87.0	42.6	56.4	48.5	58.7
HS Art and Design	39.2	5.7	6.0	99.0	89.0	35.4	76.0	71.6	76.6
John Bowne	39.9	9.2	9.4	113.0	88.3	34.1	60.0	53.0	57.8
Central Park East	40.4	.0	.	.	90.2	35.0	71.2	57.7	71.6
Christopher Columbus	40.5	18.1	28.3	125.0	84.1	27.8	56.6	51.1	54.2
Bronx Regional	41.0	16.0	17.1	.	77.0	47.3	23.3	27.4	26.7
Flushing	41.4	14.6	16.3	114.0	88.2	22.8	62.8	53.8	56.4
HS of Telecomm Art & Tech	42.7	7.0	11.9	131.0	89.5	37.6	61.7	58.7	57.0
Manhattan Ctr Math & Sci	44.0	5.6	5.1	85.0	90.1	48.0	86.4	76.0	91.6
Seward Park	44.5	24.1	36.8	193.0	85.4	49.4	47.5	36.8	51.5
Chelsea	44.9	13.4	11.0	105.0	82.9	21.8	42.9	32.3	42.7
Jane Addams	45.6	19.3	20.9	157.0	80.9	49.9	39.5	32.7	39.6
Samuel Gompers	46.3	14.5	13.3	87.0	79.1	29.0	53.2	44.4	56.5
Mabel D. Bacon	46.6	18.4	25.8	106.0	86.0	49.5	46.6	45.6	48.3
Harry Van Arsdale	46.6	3.4	.	124.0	80.8	27.5	56.5	33.2	40.6
Middle College	46.7	24.2	.	.	79.0	31.9	43.7	.0	47.5
John Jay	47.2	14.7	21.3	137.0	78.6	24.2	51.3	47.9	56.3
Satellite Academy	47.6	30.3	40.6	.	74.1	36.4	41.2	36.1	38.1
Franklin K. Lane	47.7	25.0	25.2	.	79.6	18.2	44.0	35.6	37.7
International HS	48.5	6.8	.	.	92.6	53.7	8.5	5.0	11.0
Fashion Industries	48.6	17.3	22.2	100.0	85.2	61.3	50.0	[illegible]	59.7
Queens Vocational	51.1	16.6	15.9	156.0	84.7	35.0	51.7	44.1	44.5
Norman Thomas	51.9	10.2	11.2	140.0	83.5	30.9	56.1	44.9	55.0
DeWitt Clinton	52.6	23.0	28.5	115.0	81.3	39.1	48.4	50.8	54.3
William H. Taft	53.2	25.4	32.8	101.0	78.0	27.8	25.5	23.1	26.9
University Heights	53.7	13.7	.	.	78.5	68.5	59.3	49.3	61.9
Grace H. Dodge	53.8	15.3	16.5	109.0	82.8	63.5	46.4	42.3	53.1
Park West	54.0	25.3	28.3	76.0	77.8	49.5	48.3	45.9	48.5

Name	% Students Who Are Latino	Cohort	Hispanic Dropout Rate	Building Utilization	Attendance	Free Lunch Eligibility	% Reading At or Above Grade Level		
							1989	1990	1991
Walton	54.6	25.4	33.0	137.0	81.1	33.1	32.9	27.3	34.6
Louis D. Brandeis	56.3	24.8	24.6	128.0	81.9	45.0	37.4	27.9	30.4
Adlai E. Stevenson	56.4	23.5	26.6	127.0	85.8	39.3	49.0	45.4	52.0
Newtown	56.8	12.9	11.4	180.0	91.9	36.4	52.6	54.9	59.0
Aviation	57.7	6.9	8.7	114.0	89.3	32.9	72.5	74.2	77.3
Alfred E. Smith	58.2	18.1	21.0	89.0	76.6	47.8	48.2	42.6	50.1
Morris	59.5	24.4	23.3	186.0	74.5	50.3	30.6	24.8	35.7
Theodore Roosevelt	61.0	23.7	25.5	147.0	79.1	58.5	28.8	25.0	35.0
John F. Kennedy	64.0	16.9	18.8	136.0	84.8	31.8	49.4	49.8	58.2
Park East	66.5	37.1	35.4	.	89.2	51.8	22.8	17.5	30.7
James Monroe	67.9	20.9	23.9	136.0	76.4	47.3	29.7	24.3	37.1
Hostos-Lincoln Academy	72.3	2.9	.	.	90.0	46.3	67.6	45.6	54.3
Bushwick	74.1	23.0	25.1	170.0	80.3	43.9	26.5	23.3	29.0
Eastern District	75.4	28.9	27.8	96.0	76.9	47.9	28.0	24.0	33.9
George Washington	86.7	30.3	32.3	147.0	83.1	49.7	25.4	20.3	43.0
South Bronx	91.2	30.5	30.7	145.0	85.6	88.0	25.1	24.2	27.6

CHART A

SUMMARY OF GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA FOR THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Data reported in charts A and B include information on Board of Education licensed guidance counselors. This data does not incude other mental health providers such as SAPIS, social workers, family assistants, etc.

1. The total number of guidance counselors at the community district level is: 1268.5
2. The overall number of guidance counselors in each borough is:
   Man. 183.5 **Bronx** 316 **Bklyn.** 453 **Queens** 269 (including IS 227Q) **S.I.** 47.
3. The overall number of counselors at the elementary school level is 677.5.
4. The overall number of counselors at the middle school level is 591 .
5. The overall ratio of guidance counselor to general education students is 1:816.
6. The overall counselor to student ratio at the elementary school level is 1:1198
7. The overall counselor to student ratio at the middle school level is 1:443.
8. The overall guidance counselor to general education student ratio for each borough is:

Manhattan	1:594	
Bronx	1:513	
Brooklyn	1:591	
Staten Island	1:726	
Queens	1:643	(including I.S. 227Q)

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT - GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA
SCHOOL YEAR 1991 - 1992

COMPILED MARCH 7, 1992 A

		ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REGISTERS *			MIDDLE SCHOOL REGISTERS *			TOTAL REGISTERS			COUNSELOR/STUDENT RATIOS **						
	DISTRICT	No. Reg. Ed.	No. Sp. Ed.	Overall Elem. total	No. Reg. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Overall JHS/IS total	No. Reg. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Reg.&Spec. Education Full total	No. Elem. G.C.	Ratio Elem.	No. JHS/IS G. C.	Ratio JHS/IS	Total G. C.	Bil. G. C. Incl.	Overall Ratio - Dist.
MANHATTAN	1	6,892	525	7,417	2,548	300	2,848	9,440	825	10,265	13	1:571	10	1:285	23	3	1:446
	2	13,965	434	14,399	5,093	265	5,358	19,058	699	19,757	23.5	1:613	13	1:412	36.5	9	1:541
	3	10,032	619	10,651	3,873	344	4,217	13,905	963	14,868	28	1:380	16	1:264	44	6	1:338
	4	9,896	759	10,655	3,657	368	4,025	13,553	1,127	14,680	9	1:1184	5	1:805	14	6	1:1049
	5	10,298	674	10,972	2,911	326	3,237	13,209	1,000	14,209	24	1:457	12	1:270	36	1	1:395
	6	16,061	668	16,729	6,590	473	7,063	22,651	1,141	23,792	17	1:984	13	1:543	30	7	1:793
	TOTALS										114.5		69		183.5	32	
BRONX	7	10,059	779	10,838	3,475	637	4,112	13,534	1,416	14,950	15	1:723	19	1:216	34	7	1:440
	8	14,002	651	14,653	5,839	675	6,514	19,841	1,326	21,167	21	1:698	29	1:225	50	10	1:423
	9	20,155	1,123	21,278	7,642	962	8,604	27,797	2,085	29,882	16	1:1330	26	1:331	42	9	1:711
	10	25,709	1,354	27,063	8,967	762	9,729	34,676	2,116	36,792	59	1:459	34	1:286	93	12	1:396
	11	14,725	929	15,654	7,439	728	8,167	22,164	1,657	23,821	37	1:423	37	1:221	74	1	1:322
	12	12,990	622	13,612	4,035	402	4,437	17,025	1,024	18,049	11	1:1237	12	1:370	23	7	1:705
	TOTALS										159		157		316	46	

SOURCE:

*Population Data
Division of Strategic Planning/Research and Development
Office of Educational Data Services (10/31/91)

**By Telephone Survey of Supervisors of Guidance - All Community Districts (2/26/92). District information was found to be more up to date than data from the Ad Hoc unit of the Office of Human Resource Services.

Prepared by:

Division of Instruction and
Professional Development

Office of Student Guidance Services

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT - GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA
SCHOOL YEAR 1991 - 1992

COMPILED MARCH 7, 1992

		ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REGISTERS *			MIDDLE SCHOOL REGISTERS *			TOTAL REGISTERS			COUNSELOR/STUDENT RATIOS **						
	DISTRICT	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Sp. Ed.	Overall Elem. total	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Overall JHS/IS total	No. Reg. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Gen.&Spec. Education Full total	No. Elem. G.C.	Ratio Elem.	No. JHS/IS G. C.	Ratio JHS/IS	Total G. C.	Bil. G. C. incl.	Overall Ratio - Dist.
BROOKLYN	13	12,882	648	13,530	2,931	329	3,260	15,813	977	16,790	30	1:451	12	1:272	42	2	1:400
	14	13,198	695	13,893	4,660	470	5,130	17,858	1,165	19,023	1	1:13,893	13	1:395	14	1	1:1,359
	15	15,624	625	16,249	3,936	413	4,349	19,560	1,038	20,598	36	1:451	22	1:198	58	9	1:355
	16	8,972	482	9.454	1,977	307	2,284	10,949	789	11,738	14	1:675	11	1:208	25	1	1:470
	17	18,433	694	19,127	7,986	626	8,612	26,419	1,320	27,739	24	1:797	24	1:359	48	2	1:578
	18	11,571	498	12,069	5,076	369	5,445	16,647	867	17,514	18	1:671	17	1:320	35	1	1:500
	19	17,390	1,123	18,513	4,581	487	5,068	21,971	1,610	23,581	28	1:661	21	1:241	49	7	1:481
	20	15,156	654	15,810	7,933	434	8,367	23,089	1,088	24,177	20	1:791	19	1:440	39	3	1:620
	21	13,969	792	14,761	6,589	413	7,002	20,558	1,205	21,763	11	1:1342	16	1:438	27	0	1:806
	22	18,118	825	18,943	6,541	362	6,903	24,659	1,187	25,846	16	1:1184	20	1:345	36	2	1:718
	23	10,159	560	10,719	3,174	356	3,530	13,333	916	14,249	19	1:564	12	1:294	31	1	1:460
	32	10,354	689	11,043	5,174	447	5,621	15,528	1,136	16,664	28	1:394	21	1:268	49	5	1:340
	TOTALS										245		208		453	34	
QUEENS	24	17,920	714	18,634	8,708	498	9,206	26,628	1,212	27,840	23	1:810	22	1:418	45	6	1:619
	25	15,509	496	16,005	5,887	345	6,232	21,396	841	22,237	13	1:1231	16	1:390	29	5	1:767
	26	8,663	280	8,943	4,824	393	5,217	13,487	673	14,160	5	1:1789	10	1:528	15	0	1:944
	27	21,857	1,228	23,085	7,380	732	8,112	29,237	1,960	31,197	32	1:721	26	1:312	58	2	1:538

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT - GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA
SCHOOL YEAR 1991 - 1992

COMPILED MARCH 7, 1992 A

	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REGISTERS *			MIDDLE SCHOOL REGISTERS			TOTAL REGISTERS			COUNSELOR/STUDENT RATIOS **						
DISTRICT	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Sp. Ed.	Overall Elem. total	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Overall JHS/IS total	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Gen.&Spec. Education Full total	No. Elem. G.C.	Ratio Elem.	No. JHS/IS G. C.	Ratio JHS/IS	Total G. C.	Bil. G. C. incl.	Overall Ratio - Dist.
Q 28	16,675	709	17,384	4,914	345	5,259	21,589	1,054	22,643	23	1:756	19	1:277	42	9	1:539
U E 29	16,427	703	17,130	6,736	395	7,131	23,163	1,098	24,261	26	1:659	16	1:446	42	0	1:578
E N 30	17,345	513	17,858	5,378	393	5,771	22,723	906	23,629	20	1:893	13	1:444	33	1	1:716
S IS 227	0	0	0	1,181	158	1,339	1,181	158	1,339	0	0	5	1:446	5	1	1:446
TOTALS										142		127		269	24	
S. 31 I.	22,561	931	23,492	9,949	695	10,644	32,498	1,638	34,136	17	1:1382	30	1:355	47	1	1:726
TOTALS										1		30		47	1	

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT - GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA
SCHOOL YEAR 1991 - 1992

COMPILED MARCH 7, 1992

A

TOTALS - CITYWIDE

	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REGISTERS *			MIDDLE SCHOOL REGISTERS			TOTAL REGISTERS			COUNSELOR/STUDENT RATIOS **						
	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Sp. Ed.	Overall Elem. total	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Overall JHS/IS total	No. Gen. Ed.	No. Spec. Ed.	Gen.&Spec. Education Full total	No. Elem. G.C.	Ratio Elem.	No. JHS/IS G. C.	Ratio JHS/IS	Total G. C.	Bil. G. C. incl.	Overall Ratio - Dist.
MANHATTAN	67,144	3,679	70,823	24,672	2,076	26,748	91,816	5,755	97,571	114.5	1:619	69	1:388	183.5	32	1:532
BRONX	97,640	5,458	103,098	37,397	4,166	41,563	135,037	9,624	144,661	159	1:648	157	1:265	316	46	1:458
BROOKLYN	165,826	8,285	174,111	60,558	5,013	65,571	226,384	13,298	239,682	245	1:711	208	1:315	453	34	1:529
QUEENS Including IS 227	114,396	4,643	119,039	45,008	3,259	48,267	159,404	7,902	167,306	142	1:839	127	1:380	269	24	1:627
STATEN ISLAND	22,561	931	23,492	9,949	695	10,644	32,510	1,626	34,136	17	1:1382	30	1:355	47	1	1:726
FULL TOTALS										677.5		591		1268.5	137	

TOTALS - CITYWIDE

NEW YORK CITY	467,567	22,996	490,563	177,584	15,209	192,793	645,151	38,205	683,356	677.5	1:724	591	1:326	1268.5	1:539

GENERAL EDUCATION

NEW YORK CITY	# of Elem. Students	Elem. G.C.	# JHS Students	IS/JHS G.C.	Total Register	Total # G. C.	RATIOS Elem.	RATIOS IS/JHS	Overall Ratios
	467,567	390	177,584	401	645,151	791	1:1198	1:443	1:816

CHART B

SUMMARY OF GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA FOR 12 DISTRICTS
WITH LARGE NUMBERS OF LATINO STUDENTS

1. The overall number of bilingual guidance counselors at the community district level is 137 .
2. The overall number of Spanish speaking bilingual guidance counselors at the community district level is 129, which is 10.17% of the total number of guidance counselors in the community districts.
3. The overall number of bilingual guidance counselors in each borough is:

	Total Bilingual	Spanish Speaking	Other Languages
Manhattan	32	29	3 Chinese
Bronx	46	46	----
Brooklyn	34	31	2 Haitian Creole, 1 Albanian
Staten Island	1	1	----
Queens	24	22	1 Korean, 1 Hebrew
Total	137	129	

4. The following twelve (12) districts have the largest number of students who are Latino: Districts: 6, 1, 14, 7, 12, 32, 10, 15, 4, 8, 9 and 24.
5. The overall guidance counselor to general education student ratio for the 12 community school districts with the largest numbers of Latino students is 1:643.
6. The overall Latino guidance counselor to Latino student ratio for the 12 community school districts with the largest numbers of Latino students is 1:2,106

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Office of Student Guidance Services
131 Livingston Street - Rm. 601
Brooklyn, NY 11201

CHART B

SUMMARY OF GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA FOR DISTRICTS WITH LARGE NUMBERS OF LATINO STUDENTS

Dist.	# of Students Gen./Latino		% of Latino Students	%of LEP Spanish * Speaking Students		Total # of Guidance Counselors.	% of Non-Latino Guidance Counselors .	# of Latino Guidance Counselors	% of Latino Guidance Counselors	Overall Counselor to Student Ratio	Latino Couns. To Latino Student Ratio
				General	Spec. Ed.						
1	10,265	7,421	72.3%	82.7%		23	76.7%	3	23.3%	1:446	1:2,474
4	14,680	8,279	56.4%	98.0%		14	57.2%	6	42.8%	1:1,049	1:1,380
6	23,792	20,056	84.3%	98.4%		30	76.7%	7	23.3%	1:793	1:2,865
7	14,950	9,912	66,3%	99.5%		34	79.4%	7	20.6%	1:440	1:1,416
8	21,167	11,917	56.3%	94.8%		50	80.0%	10	20.0%	1:423	1:1,191
9	29,882	15,329	51.3%	98.7%		42	78.6%	9	21.4%	1:711	1:1,703
10	36,792	22,443	60.9%	86.9%		93	87.1%	12	12.9%	1:396	1:1,870
12	18,049	11,374	63.9%	97.4%		23	69.6%	7	30.4%	1:785	1:1,625
14	19,023	13,069	68.7%	91.8%		14	92.9%	1	7.1%	1:1,359	1:13,069
15	20,598	11,967	58.1%	76.0%		58	84.5%	9	15.5%	1:355	1:1,330
24	27,840	12,639	45.4%	62.6%		45	86.7%	6	13.3%	1:619	1:2,106
32	16,664	10,565	63.4%	96.6%		49	89.8%	5	10.2%	1:340	1:2,113
	**253,702	154,971	61.1%			475	82.5%	82	17.5%	1:534	1:1890

Source: October 1990 BESIS (Bilingual Educaton Student Information Survey) Report.

*Data for LEP Spanish Speaking Special Education Students is not available

**This line represents totals and summaries for the twelve districts in the chart

CHARTS C & D

SUMMARY OF GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA FOR THE HIGH SCHOOLS

1. The total number of guidance counselors at the high school level is 807.6
2. The total number of special education guidance counselors is 131.5
3. The total number of general education guidance counselors is 676.1

The total overall number of guidance counselors in each superintendency is:

Borough	Total	General Education	Special Education
Manhattan	129	114.0	15.0
Bronx	170	142.6	28.0
Brooklyn	153	129.5	23.5
BASIS	135	107.0	28.0
Queens	158	129.0	29.0
Alternative	62	54.0	8.0

The guidance counselor to student ratio at the high school level by borough is:

Borough	General Education	Special Education
Manhattan	1:347.9	1:153.6
Bronx	1:288.1	1:135.1
Brooklyn	1:341.3	1:125.6
BASIS	1:387.5	1:96.4
Queens	1:445.9	1:114.1
Alternative	1:544.6	1:170.0

NOTE: Data reported in charts C & D include information on Board of Education licensed guidance counselors. This data does not include other mental health providers such as SAPIS, social workers, family assistants, etc.

CHART E

SUMMARY OF GUIDANCE COUNSELOR DATA FOR 23 HIGH SCHOOLS WITH MAJORITY LATINO STUDENT ENROLLMENT

1. Twenty-three high schools have more than 50 percent Latino student enrollment.

2. There are 47,298 students in these 23 high schools
   - 4,164 students are in special education (11.4% of enrollment)
   - 10,420 students are Latino students with limited English proficiency (22% of enrollment)
   - 34.7 percent of all high school LEP students attend these 23 high schools

3. The overall number of guidance counselors in general education in these 23 high schools is 137. The overall guidance counselor to general education student ratio for these 23 high schools is 1:345 (ranging from 1:188 at Park East High School to 1:957 at Aviation High School).

4. The overall number of Spanish speaking bilingual guidance counselors in these 23 high schools is 27. The overall bilingual guidance counselor to LEP student ratio for these 23 high schools is 1:386 (ranging from 0:6 to 1:995 at George Washington High School)

5. The overall number of guidance counselors in special education in these 23 high schools is 32. The overall guidance counselor to special education student ratio for these 23 high schools is 1:130 (ranging from 0:73 at Newtown High School to 1:325 at Theodore Roosevelt High School).

6. Latino LEP students may receive bilingual and/or general guidance services.

7. Special education students may receive services by either a special education related services counselor or through general education guidance services.

FY 90-91 BOROUGH ENROLLMENT BY ETHNICITY

BOROUGH Programs	BLACK		ASIAN		HISPANIC		WHITE		NAT. AMER. INDIAN		TOTAL ENROLLMENT
	Enrl	PerCent	Enrl	PerCent	Enrl	PerCent	Enrl	PerCent	Enrl	PerCent	
BROOKLYN											
Basic Ed.	3,505 *	(24.8%)#	81	(0.6%)	963	(6.8%)	196	(1.4%)	22	(0.2%)	4,767
ESOL	914	(6.5%)	325	(2.3%)	2,563	(18.1%)	1,151	(8.1%)	16	(0.1%)	4,969
HSE	1,090	(7.7%)	18	(0.1%)	653	(4.6%)	215	(1.5%)	7	(0.0%)	1,983
AOTP/PreVoc	1,578	(11.2%)	57	(0.4%)	351	(2.5%)	406	(2.9%)	22	(0.2%)	2,414
Brooklyn Borough Total	7,087	(50.1%)	481	(3.4%)	4,530	(32.1%)	1,968	(13.9%)	67	(0.5%)	14,133
BRONX											
Basic Ed.	985	(14.9%)	83	(1.3%)	930	(14.1%)	50	(0.8%)	7	(0.1%)	2,055
ESOL	178	(2.7%)	346	(5.2%)	2,158	(32.7%)	58	(0.9%)	3	(0.0%)	2,743
HSE	443	(6.7%)	25	(0.4%)	572	(8.7%)	53	(0.8%)	8	(0.1%)	1,101
AOTP/PreVoc	331	(5.0%)	31	(0.5%)	297	(4.5%)	44	(0.7%)	6	(0.1%)	709
Bronx Borough Total	1,937	(13.7%)	485	(3.4%)	3,957	(28.0%)	205	(1.5%)	24	(0.2%)	6,608
MANHATTAN											
Basic Ed.	3,544	(17.9%)	358	(1.8%)	1,442	(7.3%)	376	(1.9%)	17	(0.1%)	5,737
ESOL	662	(3.3%)	2,494	(12.6%)	5,606	(28.3%)	641	(3.2%)	16	(0.1%)	9,419
HSE	940	(4.8%)	38	(0.2%)	989	(5.0%)	201	(1.0%)	5	(0.0%)	2,173
AOTP/PreVoc	1,302	(6.6%)	124	(0.6%)	616	(3.1%)	395	(2.0%)	17	(0.1%)	2,454
Manhattan Borough Total	6,448	(45.6%)	3,014	(21.3%)	8,653	(61.2%)	1,613	(11.4%)	55	(0.4%)	19,783

NOTES: * The number of blacks attending Basic Education Programs in Brooklyn.

The ratio of blacks attending Basic Education Programs in Brooklyn to the total Brooklyn Population (i.e. 3505/14133 = 24.8%)

DIVISION OF HIGH SCHOOLS

GUIDANCE COUNSELOR RATIOS - SELECT HIGH SCHOOLS

	GENERAL EDUCATION (1)			SPECIAL EDUCATION (2)			LEP STUDENTS (3)		
HIGH SCHOOL	10/31/91 REGISTER	# GC	PUPIL RATIO 1:	10/31/91 REGISTER	# GC	PUPIL RATIO 1:	10/31/91 REGISTER	# GC	PUPIL RATIO 1:
GEORGE WASHINGTON	3630	6	605	209	1	209	1990	2	995
LOUIS BRANDEIS	2337	5	467	183	1	183	579	2	290
NORMAN THOMAS	2487	5	497	126	1	126	198	1	198
PARK WEST	1809	5	362	180	1	180	456	1	456
ADLAI STEVENSON	3380	11	307	337	2	169	224	1	224
ALFRED E. SMITH	1529	3	510	115	2	58	36	0	0
DEWITT CLINTON	2963	12	247	237	1	237	305	1	305
GRACE DODGE	1245	4	311	175	1	175	28	0	0
JAMES MONROE	2143	8	268	232	3	77	442	1	442
JOHN F. KENNEDY	4198	7	600	225	2	113	781	4	195
MORRIS	1400	6	233	264	2	132	330	1	330
SOUTH BRONX	987	4	247	173	1	173	535	2	268
THEODORE ROOSEVELT	2974	12	248	325	1	325	970	3	323
WALTON	2240	7	320	234	3	78	541	1	541
WILLIAM H. TAFT	2259	8	282	313	2	157	685	2	343
AVIATION	1914	2	957	137	1	137	188	1	188
NEWTOWN	3568	6	595	201	2	101	998	2	499
QUEENS VOCATIONAL	1000	2	500	73	0	0	50	0	0
EASTERN DISTRICT	2325	11	211	199	3	66	609	1	609
BUSHWICK	1864	9	207	226	2	113	400	1	400
HOSTOS-LINCOLN ACADEMY	312	1	312	0	0	0	20	0	0
PARK EAST	376	2	188	0	0	0	49	0	0
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	358	1	358	0	0	0	6	0	0
TOTAL	47298	137	345	4164	32	130	10420	27	386

1. GENERAL EDUCATION STUDENTS INCLUDE LATINO LEP STUDENTS WHO MAY RECEIVE BOTH BILINGUAL AND GENERAL GUIDANCE SERVICES
2. SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS MAY RECEIVE SERVICES BY EITHER A SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED SERVICES COUNSELOR OR THROUGH GENERAL EDUCATION GUIDANCE SERVICES
3. LEP STUDENTS INCLUDE ONLY LATINO POPULATION

FY 90-91 BOROUGH ENROLLMENT BY ETHNICITY (Continue)

BOROUGH Programs	BLACK Enrl	BLACK PerCent	ASIAN Enrl	ASIAN PerCent	HISPANIC Enrl	HISPANIC PerCent	WHITE Enrl	WHITE PerCent	NAT. AMER. INDIAN Enrl	NAT. AMER. INDIAN PerCent	TOTAL ENROLLMENT
QUEENS											
Basic Ed.	1,697	(17.2%)	225	(2.3%)	666	(6.7%)	477	(4.8%)	22	(0.2%)	3,087
ESOL	339	(3.4%)	446	(4.5%)	3,022	(30.5%)	601	(6.1%)	0	(0.0%)	4,408
HSE	522	(5.3%)	66	(0.7%)	717	(7.2%)	254	(2.6%)	13	(0.1%)	1,572
AOTP/PreVoc	274	(2.8%)	124	(1.3%)	204	(2.1%)	219	(2.2%)	7	(0.1%)	828
Queens Borough Total	2,832	(20.0%)	861	(6.1%)	4,609	(32.6%)	1,551	(11.0%)	42	(0.3%)	9,895
STATEN ISLAND											
Basic Ed.	4	(0.4%)	10	(1.1%)	14	(1.5%)	13	(1.4%)			41
ESOL	35	(3.8%)	102	(11.2%)	329	(36.2%)	197	(21.6%)			663
AOTP/PreVoc	63	(6.9%)	8	(0.9%)	44	(4.8%)	89	(9.8%)	2	(0.2%)	206
Staten Island Borough Total	102	(0.7%)	120	(0.8%)	387	(2.7%)	299	(2.1%)	2	(0.0%)	910
CITYWIDE TOTA											
Basic Ed.	9,735	(19.0%)!	757	(1.5%)	4,015	(7.8%)	1,112	(2.2%)	68	(0.1%)	15,687
ESOL	2,128	(4.1%)	3,713	(7.2%)	13,678	(26.6%)	2,648	(5.2%)	35	(0.1%)	22,202
HSE	2,995	(5.8%)	147	(0.3%)	2,931	(5.7%)	723	(1.4%)	33	(0.1%)	6,829
AOTP/PreVoc	3,548	(6.9%)	344	(0.7%)	1,512	(2.9%)	1,153	(2.2%)	54	(0.1%)	6,611
GRANDTOTAL	18,406	(35.9%)^	4,961	(9.7%)	22,136	(43.1%)	5,636	(11.0%)	190	(0.4%)	51,329

NOTES: ! The ratio of the total number of blacks in Basic Education Programs to the total city wide enrollment(ie 9735/51,329 = 19.0%).

^ The ratio of the total number of blacks to the total city wide enrollment (i.e. 18,406/51,329 = 35.9%).

I. Basic Education

Basic Education classes serve native American adults who do not have a high school diploma or a GED. These classes provide instruction in reading, math, writing and communication skills. Free standing classes are offered day and evening and generally consist of 6 hours of instruction per week. Classes are usually organized into four levels based on TABE test scores (Test of Adult Basic Education).

Sometimes these classes are component parts of a larger, more comprehensive program which supplements the basic education class with volunteer work experiences, life skills classes, keyboarding instruction and an enhanced level of counseling. Students are referred according to their interest, need and ability to commit to the number of hours involved.

II. English as a Second Language

English as a Second Language classes are available to foreign born adults who want to improve their English language proficiency. Prospective students are given individual oral examinations (JOHN Test or NYS PLACE Test), and placed according to the level of language proficiency. Classes are organized in four levels.

More recently, classes have been organized to reflect additional interests or needs, such as: Classes for people who were professionals in their own country; classes for people who are illiterate in their native language; classes for those interested in preparing for work. In addition, we have begun to incorporate escalated writing and test taking skills preparation into the ESL curriculum, so that completers can move directly into GED classes, job training or employment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Committee on Counseling and Support Services

REFERENCES

Bermudez, Andrea B., Multicultural Connections, January-March, 1992

Herr, Edwin L., Why Counseling? The American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1982, p. 5

Nowhere to Turn: The Crisis in Middle School Guidance and Support. Educational Priorities Panel, August 9, 1988

Recommendations of the Chancellor's Working Group on Latino Educational Opportunity, Gladys Carrion, Chairperson, October 5, 1988

Chavez-Reilly, Priscilla, Voices from the Field. Recommendations for a Five-Year Plan for Improved Guidance and Counseling Services for Students with Limited English Proficiency, Funded by the New York State Education Department, Division of Bilingual Education, June, 1990.

III. GED Preparation

GED preparation classes are offered in English, French and Spanish, since the examination is given in these languages. For the most part, instruction is given for six hours a week and individuals are referred to take the GED exam when they achieve a certain level on the prescribed predictor examination. The GED test consists of six parts: Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, Mathematics; Readings in Science; Readings in Social Studies and a Written Essay. Foreign language versions of the test are not direct translations of the English, but are completely different.

GED instruction, too, may be part of a more comprehensive pre-vocational program.

IV. Adult Occupational Training Program

Adult Occupational Training Programs provide instruction leading to the acquisition of the necessary skills to make people job ready. Instruction is offered in the following major clusters:

A. Health Careers
    Nurse Assistant yield State Certification
    Practical Nurse

    Health Careers Pre-Vocational classes - exploration of options

B. Office Skills
    Clerical
    Secretarial
    Word Processing
    Data Processing

C. Auto/Electromechanical
    Auto/Diesel Mechanic
    Electronics
    Heating and Air Conditioning

Occupational training is offered full time, during the daytime for people who are unemployed, as well as in the evenings and Saturdays for people who want to upgrade their skills.

Job development and placement services are an integral part of this delivery system.